

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. VIII, 2.

WHOLE No. 30.

---

## I.—SPEECH MIXTURE IN FRENCH CANADA.

### A.—INDIAN AND FRENCH.

In Canada, at different periods of her history, we find all those causes existing that produce speech mixture in its various degrees, from the union of two wholly divergent idioms, as in the case of the French and Indian, down through forms of language that are more or less closely related according as they belong to the same general stock, or are contained, as special varieties, within the domain of a single common type. The conditions, furthermore, of antagonistic racial differences, of incompatible stages of civilization, of strong variations of traditional culture, of divergence of social customs, of well-marked and persistent dialect varieties, give to the problem here a many-sidedness and a kaleidoscopic coloring which are indicative, from the beginning, of its complex nature.

When the French first landed on the shores of the St. Lawrence, two great families of native speech occupied the region to the northeast of the American continent, namely, the Algonkin tribes, with their sundry dialects and sub-dialects, and the Iroquois (the Five Nations), whose generic language was in its turn divided into different species, of which the Huron was the chief representative. It was this Huron-Iroquois that prevailed in great measure throughout the district that afterwards became La Nouvelle France. In support of this statement I would appeal to the judgment of a celebrated missionary and writer, Jean André Cuoq, who for twenty years labored among the Iroquois and Algonkin tribes of Quebec: "Quelques auteurs ont pensé que les sauvages que rencontra Jacq. Cartier à Stadaconé et à Hochelaga, étaient de

race *algonquine*. C'est là une erreur que démontre la seule inspection des mots sauvages dont le célèbre navigateur nous a conservé le vocabulaire. Ce vocabulaire peu considérable, il est vrai, mais pourtant bien précieux, comprend deux listes de mots, la liste qu'il dressa dans son 1<sup>er</sup> voyage aux environs de Stadaconé, et celle des mots que dans son 2<sup>e</sup> voyage il put recueillir en remontant le fleuve Saint-Laurent jusqu'à Hochelaga." After citing a number of examples from these lists and a careful comparison of them with the modern Iroquois, the learned abbé winds up with: "Nous concluons donc . . . qu'au temps de leur découverte, les sauvages habitant les rives du Saint-Laurent parlaient une seule et même langue. . . . Nous bornant à ces exemples, nous pourrions, ce nous semble, tirer déjà notre conclusion et regarder comme une vérité démontrée, que la langue parlée à Stadaconé, à Hochelaga et autres lieux voisins ou intermédiaires, était la langue *iroquoise*."<sup>1</sup> It is, consequently, with these two forms of Indian language, the Algonkin and the Iroquois, and especially with the latter, that I have chiefly to do here in noting the mingling, or rather lack of mingling, of the French with the native idioms of this part of the North American Continent. I say chiefly, because even among the few words of Indian origin that remain in Canadian French to-day, there are some which do not belong to the domain of native speech whence we might naturally suppose that they would have been taken, and, therefore, in seeking to account for their form or to explain the phonetic changes which these vocables have undergone, we must naturally have recourse to a system of phonetic production and to laws of morphological development that, in certain cases, do not obtain in the special linguistic group with which the French emigrants had immediately to do. The causes that led to the adoption of certain terms drawn from the language of tribes with which the French were not in constant and friendly relation, must be sought, on the one hand, in the unstable social character of the early settlements, where there existed a natural spirit of adventure and conquest which urged the more daring members beyond the confines of the usual tribal territory for the purpose of exploring new domains of wealth, of carrying on a temporary traffic or of establishing regular commercial intercourse, and these brought

<sup>1</sup> Quels étaient les sauvages que rencontra Jacq. Cartier sur les rives du Saint-Laurent? pp. 1, 3, 4. Extrait du Cahier de Septembre 1869, des Annales de Philosophie chrétienne.

back with them, of course, the idioms and names used by the strange people whose customs they had often adopted in part or altogether, and with whom they had associated sometimes for many months without returning to the French settlements. And still another class, the missionaries, did not a little to bring back to the centres of population on the St. Lawrence the peculiar terms and characteristic expressions of distant and heterogeneous tribes to whom they had preached the Gospel and with whom they would labor often for years before seeking their co-workers at St. Marie (Montreal), Three Rivers and Quebec. But, on the other hand, outside of individual enterprise and religious enthusiasm, a still greater channel for the transmission of these allophylian elements was opened in the establishment, with governmental patronage, of powerful fur-trading companies that carried their commercial dealings far into the interior of the country and, through their agents, had necessarily to adopt some of the names used by those with whom their trading operations were practised. We shall see a little further on that the borrowed material, both here and in general, as taken from the native idioms, represents concrete ideas; in truth, usage seldom rises above simple names of things in these loan-words.

After a consideration of the external conditions—social, political and religious<sup>1</sup>—that have exercised an abrading, equalizing influence on the discordant, ill-assorted, multifarious elements of French society as represented in the early settlement of New France, we are prepared to move on to a treatment of those special linguistic phenomena that were the natural resultant of a fusion of the complex, varied and heterogeneous ingredients of speech which were brought together in this new civilization. From what has been said we may expect to find here a strong drift toward an amalgamation which, while it shows a certain general sameness in form and in sound product, still, when examined under the microscope of a careful dialect analysis, yields a many-colored material full of variety and puzzling aspects, replete with shadings of linguistic life so delicate that they dissolve from view in the attempt to seize and fix them. The superposition of so many different speech varieties, the crossing and recrossing of this language trait with that other of a wholly diverse nature, the sudden breaking of a line of tradition, the squeezing into a new dress and the refitting of the old material to match it, the warping of well-established laws of development,

<sup>1</sup> See this Journal, Vol. VI, pp. 135-150, and Vol. VII, pp. 141-160.

the requiring of certain grammar categories to perform new functions, the mingling of the old with the new and of the new with the old in language and dialect, sometimes the one predominating, sometimes the other—these are natural results and offer only a few points of view from which the investigator has to scan a material that is still so plastic, so fraught with the element of change, that before he is done handling it he is conscious of the possibility of conditions arising other than those in which he has just considered it.

In view of these difficulties I shall canvass the subject of speech mixture proper in French Canada in a strictly historical manner, beginning with the simplest form and proceeding to the more complex stages that developed with the political changes through which the country went by conquest and by a natural growth of power. This mode of procedure has this evident advantage that, in the beginning of the discussion, many of the perplexing questions are eliminated which naturally come up later when the conditions of the problem become more complicated through the increased number of elements that enter into it. Under this view the subject naturally falls into four parts: The mixture of the French (*a*) with the native Indian speech, (*b*) with imported idioms, such as the English, etc., (*c*) with itself, that is, in its own dialect varieties, (*d*) with different ages of the same. Let us take up (*a*) Mixture of French with the Indian.

The most typical family of North American Indians, "the Indian of Indians," as Parkman calls them, was the Huron-Iroquois stock to which passing reference was made above and whose earliest home was Upper and Lower Canada. They were thus the native historic race of the valley of the St. Lawrence, and at the same time the most aggressive tribe of the North American Continent. The oldest, if not the parent stock of the Huron-Iroquois breed was the Huron branch, and the separation from its consanguineous rival, the Iroquois proper, had already taken place in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when the French got their foothold in Canada and the Hurons entered with them into that friendly alliance which proved fatal to the savage.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Parkman, in one of his inimitable antitheses, happily characterizes the treatment of the Indian by the three chief European nations that acquired possessions in the New World, in the following manner: "Spanish civilization crushed the Indian; English civilization scorned and neglected him; French civilization embraced and cherished him."

According to the opinion of one of the ablest scholars of to-day in Indian lore, "the evidence of language, so far as it has been examined, seems to show that the Huron clans were the older members of the group; and the clear and positive traditions of all the surviving tribes, Hurons, Iroquois, and Tuscaroras, point to the lower St. Lawrence as the earliest known abode of their stock. Here the first explorer, Cartier, found Indians of this stock at Hochelaga and Stadacone, now the sites of Montreal and Quebec."<sup>1</sup>

As representatives of refugees from the massacre of 1648, perpetrated by their relentless foes, the Iroquois, the Hurons now constitute a small village, Lorette (near Quebec), the sole surviving remnant of that once powerful tribe which already in the middle of the seventeenth century had ceased to exist.

The language of these various Indian tribes with which the French came into contact, whether in a friendly way or not, was split into numerous and often widely differing dialects that bore, however, the common stamp of the North American vernacular, namely, a complex, polysynthetic character. In the special, holophrastic feature of these native idioms is to be sought one of the principal causes, I think, of the comparatively little mixing of French or of other European languages (for the same is true of the English and the Spanish) with the indigenous speech. We have abundant testimony, from the missionaries of the early settlements on the St. Lawrence, of the enormous difficulty that attached to acquiring even a moderate facility in the use of the native idioms. This must be attributed in part, at least, to the absolute lack of external helps such as grammars, vocabularies, etc., in the prosecution of these studies. The celebrated Père Lejeune, for example, after having studied Algonkin for two years, almost despaired of being able to master it and wrote: "Ils ont une richesse si importune, qu'elle me jette quasi dans la créance que je serai pauvre toute ma vie en leur langue."<sup>2</sup> Belcourt, another missionary of that time, says: "C'est l'immense quantité des désinences, rendues nécessaires par le grand nombre des modes dans les verbes, qui produit la richesse et la variété des expressions et qui rend le discours oratoire puissant, noble, cadencé. La mémoire doit faire de grands efforts pour saisir la multitude

<sup>1</sup> Horatio Hale, *The Iroquois Books of Rites*, Introduction, pp. 10, 11. Cf. Dr. D. G. Brinton's *Library of Aboriginal American Literature*, No. II.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ferland, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada*, p. 96, and *Relation de 1636*, quoted by him.

désesperante de variations dans les verbes."<sup>1</sup> "The variety of compounds," wrote the accomplished missionary, Brebeuf, concerning the Huron tongue, "is very great; it is the key to the secret of their language. They have as many genders as ourselves, as many numbers as the Greeks." Recurring to the same comparison, he remarks of the Huron verb that it has as many tenses and numbers as the Greek, with certain discriminations which the latter did not possess.<sup>2</sup> And Horatio Hale, the subtle investigator in native American linguistics, already quoted, significantly observes with further reference to the difficulty of learning the Huron-Iroquois: "It is a fact somewhat surprising, as well as unfortunate, that no complete grammar of any of the Huron-Iroquois stock has ever been published. . . . Such is the extraordinary complexity of the language, such the multiplicity of its forms and the subtlety of its distinctions, that years of study are required to master it."<sup>3</sup> The eminent missionary, Cuoq, of Montreal, a profound philologist versed in the grammatical principles of many and widely different languages, confirms these statements when he attempts to trace the outlines of the grammatical system of their respective languages: "Vouloir calquer une grammaire iroquoise ou algonquine sur le modèle d'une grammaire grecque ou hébraïque, russe ou allemande, basque même ou irlandaise, eût été un projet insensé et impossible à accomplir. Il n'y a que les hommes compétents en matière de grammaire et de linguistique qui pourront concevoir la longueur et la difficulté du travail qui va paraître sous leurs yeux; eux seuls pourront se faire une juste idée des perquisitions de tout genre et des diverses combinaisons que nous avons dû faire pour démeler la trame si merveilleuse de ces langues."<sup>4</sup> Again, in discussing Cartier's word-lists, noted above, this scholar observes: "Les légères différences qui peuvent se trouver entre les mots des deux listes ne doivent s'expliquer autrement que par l'extrême difficulté que l'on éprouve toujours, quand il faut saisir par le simple son de la voix, des mots appartenant à une langue complètement inconnue. Cette raison acquiert une force toute spéciale, quand il s'agit, comme dans le cas présent,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ferland, *ibidem*, note.

<sup>2</sup> Library of Aboriginal American Literature, edited by D. G. Brinton, M. D., Philadelphia, 1883, No. II, p. 99. Quoted from "Relation" of 1636, pp. 99, 100.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 100.

<sup>4</sup> Études philologiques sur quelques langues sauvages de l'Amérique par N. O. (Jean André Cuoq) Ancien Missionnaire. Montréal, 1866, p. 35.

d'une langue sauvage ; nous parlons ici par expérience et en appelons avec assurance au témoignage de ceux qui, comme nous, ont travaillé auprès des sauvages, et ont appris quelqu'une des langues de ces peuples."<sup>1</sup> A curious example of misconceived form, through a false appreciation of sound elements by the ear, has been perpetuated in European languages in the word *totem*, with reference to which this same writer remarks: "Je dois faire observer que *totem* est pour la langue algonquine ce que seraient pour le français des mots du genre de ceux-ci : *thomme, toiseau*; c'est à dire que trompé par la liaison du mot précédent, on a cru qu'il fallait écrire *ni totem, ki totem*, absolument comme quelqu'un qui se guidant iniquement d'après la prononciation, écrirait : *gran thomme, charman toiseau*. Il est à regretter que plusieurs écrivains de mérite aient pu commettre une pareille méprise. Ce n'est ni *totem* ni *dodem*, mais bien *Otem*." Further, a recent writer who had associated with various tribes of our American Indians tells us how many obstacles the stranger has to contend against in acquiring even a passable speaking acquaintance with any given Indian idiom : "The class of the noun determines the class of the verb, so that a speaker, grammatically skilled in the language, must know the appropriate class of each noun, as precisely as the masculine and feminine is required in the French. But there is an additional reason for accuracy in the American languages, for in the French the verb remains unchanged by its operation on the object. From this cause it is exceedingly rare to find the Indian spoken grammatically by any but natives or persons who have been accustomed to the idiom from childhood. We have never known a white man who had attained anything more, in the acquisition of the language, than an approximation to accuracy. The class of persons who visit the interior bands for the purposes of trade are commonly mere smatterers, and totally inadequate to communicate with the Indians on topics of governmental business, or the abstruse questions connected with their religion or history."<sup>2</sup>

If such, then, were the difficulties for educated minds and for men imbued with a boundless zeal to learn, in order to propagate their religious beliefs, as were these missionaries just referred to,

<sup>1</sup> Cuoq, Quels étaient les sauvages que rencontra Jacques Cartier sur les rives du Saint-Laurent ? p. 2.

<sup>2</sup> The North American Review, Vol. XLV (1837), p. 46. Language of the Algonquins, a review of Gallatin, "On the Languages of North American Indians."

how insuperable must have been the impediments to acquiring the native idioms for the ordinary French peasant and for the common fur-trader, whose intercourse with the natives was not prompted by an enthusiasm for ideal ends, but simply confined to the narrow channel of special business transactions, where a scanty supply of words was adequate to their limited necessities. In such circumstances it would be more natural, perhaps, that the savage should pick up words enough to enable him to barter with the white man, and it is probable, too, that we should find a greater infiltration, for practical purposes, of Gallic elements into Indian speech of this epoch than vice versa; in truth, hints of opposition to this procedure, on the part of the Indian, we have from writers on Canada of the sixteenth century, and, among others, I may cite again the same missionary, Belcourt, who expresses himself in the following terms with reference to the introduction into the native languages of modes of expression conflicting with established usage: "Ces langues sont moins sujettes aux changements que bien des langues écrites. Cela est dû au ridicule qui, parmi les sauvages, s'attache à ceux qui osent innover dans la langue. Les quelques changements introduits depuis trente ans, dans la langue algonquine de l'ouest, l'ont été par des métis qui ont voulu traduire littéralement des expressions françaises, employées d'une manière métaphorique."<sup>1</sup> This aversion to the use of strange constructions is easily conceivable, and particularly that the familiar and striking terms of metaphor should be set in a foreign mould; but for simple, concrete names, analogy with the language products of other savage and semi-civilized peoples would lead me to believe that the foreign elements of this sort were adopted with ease. That the effort of the Frenchman to speak the Indian dialect, to whatever sept it belonged, was necessarily much greater than that required of the savage to make himself understood in French, follows naturally from the testimony, cited above, of scholars who were wont to occupy themselves closely with the native idioms. However, the strong conservative tendencies, contrary to expectation, of some of these idioms that possess few written documents, are well established by the testimony of those most familiar with them: "A comparison of the Iroquois with the Huron grammar shows that after a separation which must have exceeded five hundred years, and has probably covered twice that term, the two languages differ less from one

<sup>1</sup> Ferland, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada*, p. 95, note.

another than the French of the twelfth century differed from the Italian, or than the Anglo-Saxon of King Alfred differed from the contemporary Low German speech.”<sup>1</sup> The characteristics of the Huron language mentioned by the historian Ferland, as drawn from the early missionaries of New France, would serve, in the absence of more positive data, to give us only a very incomplete and incorrect idea as to the effect of the mingling of this idiom with the French: “La plupart des mots de la langue huronne sont composés presque entièrement de voyelles. Cela vient de ce que plusieurs consonnes leur manquent; ainsi ils n'ont pas une seule labiale. Un missionnaire remarquait qu'ils avaient toujours les lèvres séparées, et que, lorsqu'ils parlaient bas, il était impossible de les comprendre, si l'on n'était très-accoutumé à leur langue.”<sup>2</sup>

This statement is too sweeping if applied exclusively, as the author would seem to intend it should be applied, to the Huron; for, as a matter of fact, the mother tongue of the Huron-Iroquois branch, the Old Huron,<sup>3</sup> does preserve in part the labials that have disappeared from all the special Iroquois dialects. “A comparison of any of the Iroquois dialects with the Huron as still spoken by the Wyandots of Ontario, shows the *m* to be in use by the latter.”<sup>4</sup> And again, the same writer remarks, page 88: “The habit of invariably speaking with the lips open is the source of very curious modifications in the Iroquois vocabularies when compared with that of the Wyandots (the Indian name for Huron). The *m* gives place to *w*, *nw*, *nh*, or *nhu*, also to *ku* and *nkw*, and so frequently changes the whole character of the word by the modifications it gives rise to.” Example, English *Mary*—*Wari*, etc. “Il y avait des hommes qui nous demandoient d'apprendre le François avec eux, mais comme en toute leur langue il ne se trouve aucune lettre labiale, ny les une ny les autres n'en pouvoient prononcer une seule que tres difficilement. Pour dire *P.* ils disoient *T.* Pour *F. S.*, & pour *M. N.*, &c., & par ainsi il leur

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Horatio Hale, *The Iroquois Book of Rites*, p. 113. Dr. Brinton's Library of Aboriginal American Literature, Vol. II.

<sup>2</sup> Ferland, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada*, p. 95.

<sup>3</sup> The Huron speech became the Iroquois tongue in the form in which it is spoken by the Caniengas, or Mohawks (Horatio Hale, *The Iroquois Book of Rites*, p. 13).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Daniel Wilson, *The Huron-Iroquois of Canada, a typical Race of American Aborigines*. *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada for 1884*, Section II, p. 55 sq.

eut été comme impossible de la pouvoir apprendre dans leur païs (l'entends les personnes aagées) qu'avec une grand longueur de temps & des peines indicibles, & suis assuré qu'un jeune garçon Huron s'efforça deux ou trois cens fois pour pouvoir prononcer la lettre *P.* & ne pû iamais dire que *T*, car voulant dire *Pere Gabriel* il disoit *T. Aueil.*<sup>1</sup> It seems, therefore, a distinction must be made between the Iroquois, as such, and the Huron in the use of labials, but, in another part of their phonetics, they do agree as to a treatment that must have deeply affected the physiognomy of the French vocables added to their word-supply: "In none of the Huron-Iroquois dialects is any distinction made between *o* (guttural) and *u* (guttural); *k* (*g*) of other dialects is frequently softened to phonetic *j* in Huron: *canocha* (house) *janoñsha*, *canada* (town) *jandata*, *cohena* (island) *jawenda*, etc.; in none of the special Iroquois languages are *dt*, or *gk*, *ou* separated, and consequently the French missionaries represent these sounds by simple *t*, *k*, *o*."<sup>2</sup> It was not alone, however, the greater simplicity within certain well-defined groups of sounds, such as the guttural, the dental, etc., that marked these idioms and had a generalizing, levelling effect upon the differences of French phonetic production circumscribed by generic lines, but, according to Cuoq, who, besides valuable contributions to other Indian dialects, wrote a grammar of the Iroquois and a "Lexique de la langue Iroquoise," less than half the French alphabet is required to represent faithfully the phonic varieties which he found in this particular family of Indian speech; namely, *a*, *e*, *f*, *h*, *i*, *k*, *n*, *o*, *r*, *s*, *t*, *w*. In this author's *Études philologiques sur quelques Langues sauvages de l'Amérique*, especially the Second Part containing a treatment of the *Système grammatical des langues algonquine et iroquoise*, we find a clear presentation of this subject, which, though far from being exhaustive, gives reliable data touching these idioms and excels anything else of this sort that we possess. We may hope for more material and better opportunity to study the Iroquois when the works now in preparation shall have been finished.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire du Canada et voyages que les frères mineurs Recollects y ont faits pour le conuersion des infidelles diuisez en quatre liures fait et composé par le F. Gabriel Sagard Theodat, Mineur Recollect de la Province de Paris. à Paris 1636, Vol. II, pp. 330-31.*

<sup>2</sup> *Daniel Wilson, ibidem, pp. 78, 102.*

<sup>3</sup> *For the work of Mrs. E. A. Smith, of Jersey City, in the preparation of a series of chrestomathies of the Iroquois language, see first annual report of the Bureau of Ethnology, 1879-80, by J. W. Powell, Director, p. xxii.*

According to the scheme proposed by Cuoq, the following sounds, *b, c, g, j, l, m, p, q, u, v, x, y, z*, are wanting in the Iroquois; that is, the labial group is reduced to the single voiceless fricative (labio-dental) *f*; the guttural vowels fall to two (*a, o*); liquids have one representative only instead of two; of the nasals, only dental *n* sticks; guttural consonants are reduced to one-third of their French signs and dental sibilants fall to one-third. The following comparative table will show the simplicity which is thus reached by the use of only twelve signs instead of the French twenty-five:

VOWELS.		CONSONANTS.	
<i>Iroquois.</i>	<i>French.</i>	<i>Iroquois.</i>	<i>French.</i>
Guttural	<i>a, o</i>	<i>a, o, u</i>	<i>k</i> <i>c, g, k, q</i>
Palatal	<i>e, i</i>	<i>e, i (y), ö, ü</i>	wanting <i>ñ</i>
Labial			<i>f, w</i> <i>b, p, v, f, m</i>
Dental			<i>s, t, r, n</i> <i>d, t, z, s, ž, š, r, l, n</i>
	and voiceless <i>h</i> .		

With so simple a phonetic system as this it is evident at a glance what serious disturbance in form and sound the French language must have undergone in the mouth of the natives (the Iroquois) along the St. Lawrence. But with another member of the long-lived Iroquois league, the Mohawks, the French were brought into contact, and, according to Max Müller, their language has no labials of any kind: "It is a fact that the Mohawks never, either as infants or as grown-up people, articulate with their lips. They have no *p, b, m, f, v, w*."<sup>1</sup> In commenting upon this statement, President Wilson observes that Dr. Oronhyatekha, the native Mohawk who had given the Oxford professor this information, goes even further, rejecting not only the six letters already mentioned, but also *c, g, l, z*, and thus reduces the alphabet for this dialect to sixteen letters.<sup>2</sup> Now, it will be a matter of great interest, when these native dialects shall be properly worked up, to observe whether any, or how much, trace of French influence is manifest in them respectively, and how deeply the Gallic speech has been affected by the loss of sound and flexion so necessary to suit it to practical use in these idioms. Our present knowledge of the native languages of the St. Lawrence Valley at the time of the arrival of the French is not sufficient to enable us to trace with accuracy the speech mixture on the Indian side. That there

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on the Science of Language, 2d series, p. 162.

<sup>2</sup> Daniel Wilson, l. c., pp. 87-8.

has been no permanent borrowing is manifest in the language of the Huron colony of Lorette (New Quebec), where they have been in contact with Europeans since the establishment of the French colony at Quebec and yet their speech does not show strongly marked signs of deterioration. From a linguistic point of view there is more poetry than truth in Parkman's statement: "Here (Lorette) to this day the tourist finds the remnant of a lost people, harmless weavers of baskets and sewers of moccasins, the Huron blood fast bleaching out of them, as, with every generation, they mingle and fade away in the French population around."<sup>1</sup>

Let us now proceed to a consideration of the chief phonetic and morphological features that characterize the few examples which I have been able to collect of the process of amalgamation of Indian and French. It is evident that this mixture may take place in two directions: we have the products of the dialect in the mouth of the Frenchman, or those of the French language in the mouth of the savage, and, as hinted above, since we may expect *a priori* that the more complicated and perplexing grammatical relations of the savage idiom would render the employment of the foreign language, in the first case, more limited than the conditions imposed of passing in practical use from the more involved to the simple grammar machinery in the second case, I shall start with examining the traces of Indian transferred to the French, since the material preserved to us here is confined to only a few words, which, however, possess a strong interest for us, since they represent thoroughly popular usage. It is a curious fact, worthy of note in this connection, that though these Indian dialects possess an abundant vocabulary for the detailed and accurate expression of abstract ideas, and though their writings deal largely in metaphor and simile, yet not a single example of such usage, so far as I know, is to be found among the vocables that have lived in French. One would naturally expect, I think, that in their extended, constant and varied relations with the numerous missionaries scattered through the different tribes, and particularly since these pioneers of the Christian faith were unremittingly occupied with the presentation of spiritual truths and the discussion of the finer aspects of a new religion, there would be left in the language some impress of this life; but with the exception of a

<sup>1</sup> Francis Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 432-3.

single term, to be noted below, all evidences of this extensive relation have vanished, if they ever existed, and we are restricted in forming our judgment of the borrowing by the European language, to a meagre list of commonplace terms representing a very limited range of thought. We shall find, on the contrary, that the Indian has accepted many terms and modes of expression from the missionary. This would naturally arise for the description of all such Church functions and relations as were not easily translatable into the native dialect; transliteration being very common with them to express those religious rites that were totally unknown to the savage mind, such as the confession, for example, and for which there existed either no equivalents at all, or so inadequate verbal representations of the ceremony that the words possible for this use were without special significance. In these cases, therefore, the foreign vocable was adopted bodily after having undergone the peculiar phonetic and morphological changes that characterized the speech of each given dialect.

We shall first take the individual words adopted by the French. A few of these are equally common both to English and to French usage; for example:

TOMAHAWK (Algonkin *tomehagen*, Mohegan *tumnahegan*, Delaware *tamoihcan*), "a kind of war hatchet used by the American Indians."<sup>1</sup> A writer in the North American Review, Vol. XLV, p. 55, assigns this word, without comment, to the Mohegan, but the nearer approach of the adopted form to the Algonkin type would naturally suggest this dialect as the more direct source of the word. The spelling with *w* would seem to indicate that the Canadians have taken it from the English. In the early missionary records, however, it is spelled with *ou*, so that the present mode of writing it might represent simply a later stage of graphic sign usage. I do not find it recorded in any of the small vocabularies that contain special Canadian words.

MOCASSIN (Algonkin *makisin*.) "Châteaubriand parle de Mocassines de peau de rat musqué, brodées avec du poil de porc-épic(?) Le mocassin est un soulier de peau de chevreuil, ou d'original, sans semelle, avec des demi-guêtres qu'on assujétit au dessus du pied avec des courrois."<sup>2</sup> The writer referred to above (N. Am. Rev.) attributes also this word to the Mohegan.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Webster's English Dictionary, s. v.

<sup>2</sup> Glossaire Franco-Canadien par Oscar Dunn, Quebec, 1880, s. v.

WIGWAM (Algonkin *miki8am*, "house").<sup>1</sup> This word has probably come into European languages subject to some Huron or Huron-Iroquois influence, since the initial labial *m* has been replaced by the voiced bilabial *w*; and the use of this graphic sign would further point to the English as the medium through which it had reached the French, unless, as in *tomahawk*, it represents simply a more recent spelling.

Outside of these words, common to both English and French usage, we may possibly find a couple of dozen that belong exclusively to the French. Of course, in this enumeration, proper names, especially geographical designations, are left out of account, since they form a class to themselves, and are very abundant in certain parts of the lower provinces of Canada. It would be an interesting, instructive study to collect these striking and often *bilderreiche* topographical names and to seek their sources in the pictorial imagination of the rude savage. Nowhere else, perhaps, in the whole range of language have the figures of prosopopoeia and antonomasia been more successfully and beautifully applied in the creation of special appellations. For the present, then, I shall omit any reference to these subtle formations, as I hope at some time in the future to treat them in a separate chapter on specific Indian-French onomatology.

Before proceeding to a consideration, individually, of the vocabularies here presented, I will give them in alphabetical order according to a list made up by me and supplemented by two Canadian French writers<sup>2</sup> whose critical and accurate knowledge of their language is not excelled by that of any of their colleagues to-day. This list, as is seen, covers but nineteen specimens, and these, with only one or two exceptions, are simple names of things, or, in other words, plain terms representing concrete ideas. The number is a little longer than it was thought possible to find when we

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cuoq, *Études philologiques sur quelques langues sauvages*, p. 42. The sign 8 = Eng. *w*. For a curious derivation of this word from a form *wékwom-ut*, see Webster's Dictionary, s. v. *Wékwom-ut* is here supposed to be an Algonkin locative case, whereas Cuoq gives the true locative *miki8am-ing* (cf. l. c.).

<sup>2</sup> I refer to the celebrated historian and poet, Mr. Benjamin Sulte, of Ottawa, whose numerous works have thrown great light on the early history of La Nouvelle France, and to the graceful poet, novelist, and writer on language, Mr. Napoleon Legendre, of Quebec, whose polished and chaste diction has won for him the enviable reputation of being one of the best stylists of his country.

began our quest of these strangers in the French language of Canada. Mr. Sulte wrote me at that time, after jotting down all of them that he could find: "Peut-être existe-t'il parmi nous d'autres expressions sauvages, je vais tâcher de m'en assurer. Si je puis former, en tout, une liste de quinze de ces mots ce sera le plus possible." As intimated above, the number may likely yet be increased by a very few words of infrequent use, but we certainly have by far the bulk of them: *babiche*, *Manitou*, *matachias*, *micouenne* (*micouane*), *micmac*, *mitasse*, *nugâne*, *ouaouaron* (*wawaron*), *oualamiche* (*walamiche*), *ouragan*, *pagaie* (?), *petun*, *pictou*, *picouille*, *piroque*, *saccacomi*, *sagamîle*, *sacaqua* (*sassaqua*), *tobogan*. The origin of some of these, that is, the determination of their exact meaning and of the particular dialect to which any given etymon belongs, I have been able in certain cases to settle for myself, while in others I have received valuable assistance from Dr. Daniel G. Brinton, of Philadelphia (Professor of American Linguistics and Archaeology in the University of Pennsylvania), whose numerous researches in native American lore and whose untiring investigations in Indian speech have revealed to us a spirit-life hitherto unsuspected among the aborigines of this continent, and constituted him an authority to whom the scholar turns with great pleasure when dealing in these matters.

If we now take up these words severally we have:

**BABICHE.**—(From the Algonkin verbal ending *-bij*, "to tie."—Dr. Brinton.) Mr. Legendre, in referring to this term, says: "There is the word *babiche*, which means a string cut from a raw hide and used by our *habitants* in making their shoes." Mr. Dunn, *Glossaire Franco-Canadien*, states the same in other words: "En canadien pop., Lanières de peau de mouton, de chevreuil, de caribou ou d'original, avec lesquelles on coud les souliers sans semelle faits à domicile." Mr. Legendre continues and gives an interesting case of misconception of this word on the part of English boys: "But what is curious about it is that our boys give it out as an insult to their English comrades; they cry out *Tu sens la babiche*, and the English boy will invariably take it for 'Tu es un son of a bitch,' inde irae."

**MANITOU.**—Algonkin, "Génie" (Spirit, God). This is the most common strictly proper name in our list, but its meaning has been so extended in Canadian speech as to signify *génie* in general. In his criticism of Henry R. Schoolcraft's work entitled "The Indian in his Wigwam," Mr. Cuoq, dealing with this word, shows that

none of the dialects write *Monedo*, or *Maneto*, or even the correct form *Manito*, which latter can have this transcription only when preceded by the adjective *kije* "great," with the double signification of "great" and "good"—*kije Manito*, "le grand et le bon génie." He adds, however, in a note: "Le mot 'Manito' s'emploie pourtant quelquefois sans être précédé de 'kije,' mais seulement en poésie, et dans ce cas, il est employé par antonomase." The French have seized upon the simple word irrespective of its attributive qualifier *kije*, and made it their own by extending and generalizing the signification.

MATACHIAS.—"Rassades dont on orne les habits des sauvages" (Sulte).

MICOUENNE or MICOUANE.—*Cri*: From *Mikkiw*, to use a sharpened flat bone for scraping fat from a skin, etc. (Dr. Brinton). Cuillère de bois, plutôt grande que petite (Sulte). A kind of wooden spoon (Legendre). Dunn gives the following: Grande cuillère de bois, qu'on emploie généralement pour tirer le pot-au-feu du chaudron, et, dans le peuple, pour servir la soupe. C'est la *mouvette* des Normands.

MICMAC.—Here, again, we have a proper name, so extended in meaning as to have become a general term. The Micmacs were an eastern tribe living to the north of the Bay of Fundy, along the Gulf of St. Lawrence (Bay of Gaspe, etc.). "The dialects of those three eastern nations, the Micmacs, the Etchemins and the Abenakis, have great affinities with each other, but, though evidently belonging to the same stock, differ widely from the Algonkin language. They were all early converted by the Jesuits, remained firmly attached to the French, and, till the conquest of Canada, were in an almost perpetual state of hostility with the British colonists. In the year 1754, all the Abenakis, with the exception of the Penobscots, withdrew to Canada."<sup>1</sup> It was from this fact that the Micmacs fought so bravely on the side of the French in their struggle against the English, which caused their name to be handed down as a perpetual souvenir of their bloody deeds, and to-day, *il y a du micmac là dedans* signifies in Canadian

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gallatin, Albert, "A Synopsis of the Indian Tribes within the United States, east of the Rocky Mountains and in the British and Russian Possessions in North America," published in "Archaeologia Americana: Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society," Vol. II, p. 32. Likewise the detailed "Map of the Indian Tribes of North America about 1600 A. D. along the Atlantic," appended to this extensive essay of 264 pp.

speech: There's fire and the sword, there's destruction in it (referring to any given undertaking or enterprise); *il fait du micmac*: he brings destruction into everything. Dunn adds the more recent and at present more common meaning, "embarras," "intrigue": Il y a bien du micmac dans cette affaire. Cf. his *Glossaire Franco-Canadien*, sub voce.

**MITASSE.**—Cri, *'itas*, or *mitas*, a legging (Dr. Brinton). Sulte remarks: "Ce sont (*mitasses*) des bas à la sauvage. Autrement dit, une sorte de guêtre, très ornée. On les fait avec du cuir souple, ou du drap. C'est très élégant." And Dunn gives the same idea in the following terms: "Guêtre en peau de chevreuil ou en drap, ornée de dessins de rassades ou de poil d'original de différentes couleurs."

**NUGÂNE** (origin?), a cradle (Legendre).

**OUAOUARON**, or **WAWARON**, Huron *oüaron*, crapaux vers (Sagard). The missionary Sagard notes this word under the general heading "Bestes à quatre pieds" in his *Dictionnaire de la langue Huronne* (Paris, 1632), added to his extensive work on the history of Canada.<sup>1</sup> This word is evidently a purely onomatopoetic creation, and Dunn remarks, after defining it as "grosse grenouille verte," on dit qu'il *beugle*, et les Anglais l'appellent Bull-frog, grenouille-boeuf.

**OUALAMICHE**, or **WALAMICHE** (origin?), A kind of salmon in Lake St. John (Legendre).

**OURAGAN** (origin?), Cassot ou vase fait d'écorce d'arbre (Sulte).

**PAGAIE** (origin?), A paddle (Legendre). Mr. Legendre places an interrogation mark after this word, showing that he is doubtful whether the popular judgment is correct in attributing its source to the savage speech.

**PETUN** (origin?). The word *Petun*, which was the Indian name for tobacco, is still in use in some parts of the country; I have even heard *pétuner* instead of *fumer* (Legendre).<sup>2</sup>

**PICHOU** (origin?), Nom d'un être laid ou malin. "Laid comme un pichou" (Sulte).

**PICOUILLE** (origin?), Animal maigre à l'excès (Sulte).

<sup>1</sup> *Histoire du Canada, etc.*, cited under 17, constitutes Vol. IV.

<sup>2</sup> This name, The Tobacco Nation (*Nation du Petun*), was given by the French, and probably also by the Algonkins, to one of the Huron tribes, the Tionontates, noted for the excellent tobacco which they raised and sold. Cf. Horatio Hale, I. c., pp. 171, 172, appendix, note A.

PIROQUE (origin?). In answer to an inquiry as to whether the Canadian French use the word *canoe* as well as *wigwam* and *tomahawk*, common to the English, Mr. Legendre replied: "We never use *canoe*, but we always use *canot*. The difference between us and the Français de France is, that we have the word only with the signification of *piroque*, and they often make use of it with the same meaning as *chaloupe*. *Piroque* is an Indian word francisé." From this it is evident that the Indian term is strictly equivalent in meaning to the English *canoe*.

SACCACOMI, from *sakav*, to light by fire, *sakaipwagane*, to light a pipe (Dr. Brinton). Une plante des forêts du Canada, de la hauteur de celle que nous appelons 'petit tobac de Virginie.' Lorsque Cartier et plus tard Champlain arrivèrent en Canada, les sauvages fumaient cette plante. Encore aujourd'hui, bon nombre de nos habitans la fument et ils lui donnent toujours son nom sauvage pour la distinguer du tobac proprement dit (Sulte).

SAGAMITÉ is, I know, Algonkin, but I cannot put my hand on the original form (Dr. Brinton). Bouillie de blé d'Inde (Sulte). Mr. Legendre uses bouillie de maïs.

SACAQUA, or SACAQUÉ (origin?), Bruit, hurlement, tapage: Faire un sacaqua insupportable (Sulte). Dunn spells the word *sasaqua*: "Faire la sasaqua."

TOBOGAN, *Cri* Otobanask, traîneau (Dr. Brinton). Mr. Sulte spells it *tobagane* and gives as definition: traîneau sans patines, fait d'une planche mince et recourbée par un bout. Mr. Legendre writes *tobogan*. In the Supplement, Vol. III, of Webster's Dictionary, s. v., is made the usual general statement that characterizes the explanations in this work of all these Indian words: toboggan—corruption of American Indian *Odabogan*, sled.<sup>1</sup>

If we now turn to the other side of our subject, to a consideration of the linguistic products resulting from the use of French by the natives, we shall find that the material is much more abundant and varied than that incorporated into the French, and that the deviation from the original type is naturally in accordance with the simple phonetic system of each Indian dialect. A notable difference is further to be remarked between the foreign material taken

<sup>1</sup> In this list, all the words marked (origin?), with the exception of *piroque*, are thought by Dr. Brinton to belong to Algonkin roots, either *Cri* or "Old Algonkin," but as I have not access to Lacombe, *Lexique de la langue des Cris*, or to Cuog's *Lexique Algonquin*, I am unable, at present, to determine more specifically their particular dialect etymons.

up by the European idiom and that in the Indian dialect ; namely, not only words but phrases of Gallic origin are freely used, and in the former we shall find the same power of combination which characterizes Romance speech in the manipulation of Germanic stems, that is, foreign roots with Indian formative and grammatical elements appended. These are used with both the verb and the nomen series, and that they should be found here shows a power of adaptation and a tendency to speech mixture of which the French did not avail itself in like circumstances, but for linguistic causes of a totally different nature. Possessing a language with a grammatical machinery so much more simple than the savage, and this form of speech being fully established by a long tradition of abundant literary composition, these circumstances, together with the natural and inevitable influence of a stage of superior civilization, must have exercised a marked effect upon all the relations of the earlier settlers of Canada with their savage neighbors and, particularly on the side of language, have had a strong conservative tendency. It was the familiar and simple instrument, easily handled by its users, whether native or foreign, brought into competition with an exceedingly complicated and strange implement, whose most elementary workings were wholly foreign to anything that the common European had ever seen. Furthermore, it is but consistent with the monotony of his daily occupation, the limited range of his experience, the undeveloped state of what might be called his commercial intercourse, the lack of free social life, his naturally taciturn disposition, the innate jealousy as to his own interests and suspicion as to the intentions and actions of the white man, that the ordinary savage should have used as limited a vocabulary as possible with the French *habitant*, and that the latter should, in consequence, have preserved only a few bare traces of the strange languages, and that these should be restricted almost entirely to the names of such utensils or objects of savage use as were unknown to Europeans. This fact is significant, it seems to me, in an estimate of the degree of relation that prevailed between the two races here brought together, and goes far to prove that contact with the natives on the part of the French was generally of a superficial nature. I am aware that the mixture of French and Indian blood has produced the well-known class of *metis*, half-breeds, members of which are found here and there throughout Canada, but these are comparatively few in numbers, and play a very insignificant rôle when placed in contrast with the

great body of natives who came within the reach and power of European civilization. To these *metis*, however, I would attribute, for the most part, the special influence under which French vocabularies and modes of speech have been incorporated into the native idiom in a manner now to be noticed. To recall, first, what has been said above with reference to the phonetics of the Iroquois, we have the following practical examples: Antipathy to the use of labial nasal *m*, in *8ishe* (for Michel), for which the legitimate bilabial *w* has been substituted. But this is not exclusively the case, as is seen in *Tier* (for Pierre), where the dental mute has supplanted the labial mute. These two words in some other dialects, for instance in the Algonkin, hold nearer to the original in the preservation of the initial labial, but here again we find a special aversion to the dental liquid element as a final, e. g. *Micen* (Michel), *Pien* (Pierre), *Pon* (Paul). Other examples, showing like phonetic characteristics, we have in *Sesin* (Cécile), *Basin* (Basile), and for medial *r*, *l*, *Mani* (Marie), *Anjenik* (Angélique), *Annemon* (Allemand).

Simple assibilation of the voiced dental fricative *j* (ž) we have in Iroquois *Soset* (Josephte), where it is doubtful whether the initial sibilant is voiced or voiceless. The missionary Cuoq, from whose "Études philologiques sur quelques langues sauvages" this example is taken (p. 90), counts the sign *s* in his system of transcription as always voiceless, and expressly states this on page 9: "Ainsi *S* et *T* gardent toujours leur son propre, comme en Grec et en Hebreu, et jamais ne s'adoucissent comme en français," but, in this very word, there can be no doubt that the medial *s* sibilant is regularly represented in Cuoq's system by *z*. Our doubts are further aroused as to the exactness of the notation when, a few lines below, we read: "Le *C* algonquin se prononce à l'italienne, c'est-à-dire comme *ch* français ou *sh* anglais" (sic!). This *s* is used as an equivalent of *ss* in *cassé* (carreau cassé = karo kase) in illustration of the Iroquois (p. 10), but in the Algonkin we have *Jozep* (Joseph), where the quality of the medial sibilant is surely the same as in *Soset* (Josephte). The same sign, *s*, if the notation can be trusted for the initial, is thus used for both voiced and voiceless fricative (ž, č), since *Sarot* represents the French *Charlotte* (p. 90), and we have here, consequently, a reduction of two original sounds to a single equivalent of a different grade. Whether this generalization is universal for the Iroquois, I have no means of accurately determining. According

to further representations of these two species of sounds by other writers,<sup>1</sup> no distinction was made between them by the Algonkin tribes; but, instead of using, as their equivalent, the pure sibilant, they have the voiceless fricative  $\check{s}$ , which, if pronounced in strict accordance with the English  $\check{s}$  (*sh*), has of course changed quality: Auch die französ. *ch*, *j* sind wohl mit gesenkter Zungenspitze gebildet, die norddeutschen und englischen  $\check{s}$  aber mit gehobener Zungenspitze.<sup>2</sup> No discrimination between English *sh* and French *ch* is evidently thought of, therefore, in the transcription of the two examples given below as drawn from the Algonkin: "While, as we have seen, the Mohegans have adopted words from the European nations with whom they, for upwards of three centuries, lived in close contact, the Algonkin tribes have evinced either similar wants, by adopting and incorporating into their language several words from the French, as the following:

*Bosho*, from *Bon jour*.

*Mushwa*, from *Mouchoir*.<sup>3</sup>

But it would seem that it is not alone the French  $\check{z}$  (*j*) and  $\check{s}$  (*ch*) which are given by the English sounds *sh*, according to this writer, but even, in certain cases, the simple *s* must be thus represented, as in the example quoted by him (l. c.), *Ishpio* for *Espagnol*. Here, probably, it is the following labial (*p*) that has influenced the pronunciation, just as in the characteristic Low German combination *sp* =  $\check{sp}$  in the High German pronunciation of South Germany to-day. As to the gutturals, the various graphic signs and combinations of signs in French find their legitimate transcription in a simple form; as, for example, in the representation of all voiceless gutturals, whether simple or complex, the *k* is sufficient, and we have in Algonkin, therefore, for French *Jacques* the rational *Jak*. So, too, in the example given above, *Anjenik*, the *ik* reproduces the French termination *-ique*. Again, in *zotik*, for French *zotique*, we have the same.

For the representation of the dental class by a single sign (here, mute for sonant), we have the name *Herotiat* in the example: *Kaiatase onistenha Herotiat kon8aiatsk8e* ("la mère de la fille s'appelait Hérodiade").

We have here some striking examples of speech mixture where not only Indian and French elements enter into combination, but

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *North American Review*, Vol. XLV (1837), p. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Sievers, *Grundzüge der Phonetik*, p. 104.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *North American Review*, Vol. XLV (1837), p. 55.

even a third one, the English, is added, and all three are welded together in one compound so as to make it difficult sometimes to separate them ; as a rule, however, the process of agglutination is so loosely carried out that the component parts of the new product may be easily recognized. More striking still is the combining of two foreign elements, not belonging to the same language and neither of which is Indian, into a single vocable which is afterward manipulated by the natives with all the ease and accuracy that characterize home-made forms. We have thus four distinct stages of amalgamation, namely : 1. The French or English word used entire. 2. French word or words + Indian flexion. 3. English word + Indian flexion. 4. French word + English word = Indian. The first class includes such simple forms as *enska shiron* (un shilling), *enskat ons* (une once), *enskat minut* (une minute), *enska kateron* (un quarteron), *enska karen* (un gallon). The form *kac* (cachele) is "une rencontre purement fortuite" according to Cuoq ;<sup>1</sup> such forms as *sakut* "sugar," *pepun* "pepper," *waiskuk* "whiskey," *hummun* "hammer," and, if we follow popular tradition, the curious *Yangeese* (Yankees), imperfect Indian pronunciation of the word "English,"<sup>2</sup> from the English ; and *aik* "vinegar," *saugh* "saw," *tubok* "tobacco," from the Dutch, show that words were adopted in the savage idioms promiscuously from whatever foreign languages they chanced to come into contact. It naturally happens that these alien forms, when taken up into one dialect, sometimes pass to others, and at each transfer undergo certain phonetic or morphological changes necessary to adapt them to easy use in the dialects, respectively, where they find a new home. As chief characteristics for these migrations of speech elements, "change of accent is the first innovation, in the words of kindred tribes and families separated from each other. The interchangeable consonants next feel the effects of the separation. The letters *b* and *p*, *d* and *t*, *l* and *n*, *v* and *f*, etc., change places. Vowels next feel the power of change ; the long become short, the broad diphthongal, etc. Oral syllabication is miserably performed, where there are no alphabetical signs to fix the sounds."<sup>3</sup> This would account for the fact that the same word often has great variations

<sup>1</sup> *Jugement erroné de M. Ernest Renan sur les langues sauvages.* Deuxième édition, p. 68.

<sup>2</sup> *North American Review*, Vol. IX (1819), p. 167. (Review of Hackwelder's Indian History.)

<sup>3</sup> *North American Review*, XLV, p. 41.

in pronunciation and spelling with the natives themselves; as, *Kanieke*, *Kanyenke*, *Canyangeh*, *Canienga*, the name adopted by Mr. Hale for the Mohawks;<sup>1</sup> and, again, in such contractions as *kuligatisches*, according to ordinary pronunciation, for *kiwulitwichgatisches*.<sup>2</sup> Schoolcraft, too, whose extensive practical experience with the Indians entitles him to be heard in all matters of pronunciation, however awry he may be in his etymologies, specially remarks how "barbarous nations *mouth* sound and exercise a great range of enunciation, producing changes."<sup>3</sup>

We have examples under No. 2 in the Algonkin *kopese8*, *i* (se confesser), which has given a number of derivatives in the language, such as *kopese8i8in* (la confession), *kopesendamagan* (confessional), *kopesendamage8in* (l'action de confesser), *kopesendamago8in* (confession entendu), etc. Again, *anamens-ikan* (autel) from *anamensike* (il dit la messe) = a compound locution developed out of the formula *à la messe*.<sup>4</sup>

In the third class may be cited the following forms produced by hanging on to the foreign vocable the locative affix *-ing*: chamber, chamber-*ing* ("in the chamber"), bowl, bowl-*ing* ["in (the) bowl"], table, table-*ing* ["on (the) table"],<sup>5</sup> where, of course, there has been no attempt made at a phonetic writing of the root word. These are perfect counterparts of a large number of forms that we shall find incorporated into the French from the English, when we come to that French-English speech mixture. This process is common to all language amalgamation; the natural result of long and uninterrupted contact with a more civilized people, as in the case before us, would be a tendency on the part of the savage to adopt its language material without any essential change of form, and then, in accordance with the peculiar morphological laws that obtain for the Indian idiom, to apply its formative elements to the strange matter which is thus brought within the circle of familiar grammar categories. The coalescence of these alien speech forms with the characteristic inflexions of the savage idiom, often takes place after strong modifications in the original phonetic factors of the European word. These effects are

<sup>1</sup> Horatio Hale, *l. c.*, p. 172, appendix, note A.

<sup>2</sup> Am. Quarterly Review, Vol. III (1828), p. 398. (Review of Zeisberger's Grammar of the Language of the Lanni-Lenape, or Delaware Indians.)

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Notes on the Iroquois; or Contributions to American History, Antiquities and General Ethnology, p. 383.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Cuoq, Jugement erroné de M. Ernest Renan, etc., p. 39.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. North American Review, Vol. XLV (1837), p. 57.

the result almost entirely of an imperfect comprehension of the component sound-elements when rapidly uttered, or of the slurred and slovenly pronunciation prevalent among the common people.

To our third class may be assigned the unique and interesting compound *rak8inn*, formed by a union of the French feminine article *la* with the English word *queen*,<sup>1</sup> the locution thus created from two foreign sources being then adopted as a legitimate product by the Iroquois.

But it is not only through the phonology and morphology peculiar to the Indian dialects that we find an influence exerted upon the French to produce variation from the original type; in the sentence *taxis*, also, according to Indian fashion, the French of the fifteenth century must have had to undergo changes that did violence to the tradition of the time, but some of which would have found a more natural place in the constructions of the language two or three centuries earlier. Thus, for example, the absence in Algonkin of a relational word corresponding to the French preposition *de*, to express the personal genitive, must have puzzled the French peasants who may have tried to reproduce their thoughts after the manner of their savage neighbors; for example, *Pien o masinaigan* = Pierre il livre (son livre) instead of *le livre de Pierre*. *Il* here is the third personal pronoun used as an equivalent of the possessive third person.

Again, if we take the simple direct constructions represented by the following elementary sentences, we shall appreciate how strange must have seemed to the European ear such a word-arrangement as the Indians use, even though the hearer may have understood the full meaning of each vocable: *Jean o sakih-AN Kije Manito-N* = Jean il aime le: Grand Manito ("Jean aime le Grand Génie"); *Panansa8e o takon-AN 8agoc-AN* = François il saisit le: renard ("François saisit le renard"); or, again, the simple idea of the personal genitive in the Iroquois, *Rak8inn akonistenha* = Reine sa mère ("la mère de la Reine"); the Algonkin *Bazin o pakite8-AN Pien-AN o k8isis-INI* = Basile il frappe le: Pierre il fils ("Basile frappe le fils de Pierre").

In the last example, the third personal pronoun *o* before the noun (*k8isis*) plays the rôle of possessive pronoun, as in our first example; in the other cases, before the verb, it has its legitimate value as a pronoun. These are plain illustrations and yet they

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cuoq, *Études philologiques*, p. 145.

indicate very forcibly how unwieldy the savage mould of thought must have been for any Frenchman who may have attempted to use it, even in the most trivial matters of business. It would appear next to impossible, in view of so absolutely divergent turns of expression, that the learner could ever have passed through the "translation stage" commonly reckoned in acquiring a foreign tongue. The translation of his thought into the outlandish idiom, with the fitting and adjusting necessary to reach the comprehension of his hearers, would doubtless have been far more perplexing in acquiring such languages than the direct recasting of his mental processes according to the model before him. In this must we seek, as remarked above, one of the principal causes why so few traces of the Indian idioms have lived in French. It was comparatively easy to adopt native words, singly and alone, without any regard to the *ius et norma loquendi* of the Indian dialects, and yet how scanty is this foreign coin! Its current value evidently depended almost entirely upon the total absence in Gallic speech of any adequate home staple to draw on for such uses, and, when accepted, the domestic stamp was put on the coin before it was allowed free circulation.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

## II.—POETRY IN THE LIMBURGER CHRONIK.

### I.

Travelling through the romantic valley of the Lahn, we meet about half way between Wetzlar and the Rhein the beautiful ancient city of Limburg. Situated in one of the most fertile parts of Germany, commonly called "der goldne Grund," and chiefly inhabited by a Catholic population, the city with its surroundings, especially during festive days, still bears a mediaeval appearance. Its cathedral, with an abbey founded in the tenth century, belongs to the master-works of the thirteenth century, and is said to contain the tomb of the German emperor, Conrad I, who died in 918. Limburg, however, has become still more celebrated in the history of German literature by reason of the chronicle which was written there in the latter part of the fourteenth century.

Not only containing numerous accounts of events which are of great value for the local history of the city and the bordering principalities, but also giving highly interesting descriptions of the costumes, as well as the manners and customs of the fourteenth century, of music and painting, and, above all, preserving many songs of that period, our chronicle must very early have enjoyed a great popularity, as we may see from the number of manuscripts in which it is preserved to us. When later, during the time of the Reformation and under the influence of the humanists, an interest in the study of German antiquities was awakened, a rich patrician of Frankfort-a-M., Johann Friedrich Faust, for the first time published it in 1617. Two years later a second edition was necessary. This edition, brought out under the unsuitable name of "Fasti Limburgenses," has, in spite of its many defects, until recently been the main source of information concerning the chronicle. The succeeding generation, having lost through the Thirty Years War its national self-consciousness, did not know how to appreciate the value of the book. One editor, in 1747, even complains: "dass der Historicus sich hie und dort mit Kleinigkeiten aufhalte, zum Exempel mit der Kleider-Mode, mit der Witterung, mit einfältigen Liedgern."

The two great reformers of German literature, Lessing and Herder, with their keen eye for the poetical element and their deep historical predilections, again called attention to this important document of the fourteenth century. Thus we find in Lessing's posthumous works,<sup>1</sup> under the chapter *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur von den Minnesängern bis auf Luthern 1777*, numerous extracts from the chronicle, which he characterizes with the following words: "Es ist die älteste deutsche Chronik, so viel ich weiss, äusserst merkwürdig, weil sie so viele besondere Kleinigkeiten mitnimmt, dass sie auch fleissig der Lieder gedenkt, die jedes Jahr am meisten gesungen wurden, und sie also noch oft von mir wird angeführt werden müssen."

Herder's opinion of the value of the Limburger Chronik was so high that he intended to give long extracts from it at the beginning of the third book of his celebrated *Volkslieder*.<sup>2</sup> Seeing, however, that it would take too much space, he quotes only a few sentences from it, finally giving its whole title, and expressing the wish that some one else would make proper use of it. His advice has not been followed. While some collectors of popular poetry like Uhland, Erk, Böhme and others, inserted one or two of the songs into their collections, the fame of our chronicle really rested on a few scanty and, for the most part, erroneous remarks in our histories of German literature. The principal reason for this lack of attention may, perhaps, be found in the want of a critical edition; for, strange to say, until 1883 we had nothing but a careless reprint of the imperfect edition of Faust. We owe it to the diligent research of Arthur Wyss that we now possess an excellent edition of the chronicle in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. In his little treatise "Die Limburger Chronik untersucht von Arthur Wyss," he, for the first time, inquires into the relation of the different MSS, at the same time settling the question as to the authorship of our document. The results of his investigations being reinforced by fortunate discoveries, were afterwards embodied in his large edition just named.

An inquiry into the nature of the poetry contained in the Limburger Chronik, its origin, and its relation to former and later lyrics, may be justified by various reasons. While the student will perhaps welcome a handy collection of the songs interspersed in the Chronik which he now can only find in the insufficient form of Faust's text, made by a dilettante musician in the *Jahrbuch für*

<sup>1</sup> Lessing, ed. Lachmann, XI 468. <sup>2</sup> Herder, ed. Suphan, XXV 320, 459.

musikalische Wissenschaft,<sup>1</sup> he will probably also wish for a critical text. For Arthur Wyss, in his laudable effort to give, by the aid of certain documents, the original form of the chronicle, has frequently, for the sake of a "normalisirte Text," reconstructed the language, not always to the advantage of the poems. The principal aim of this paper, however, will be to inquire whether the poetry in our chronicle is "Volkspoesie," or whether it belongs to the declining "Minnepoesie" or the rising "Meistergesang." A very interesting and lively discussion as to the age of lyrical Volkspoesie, which, of course, would also affect other forms of poetry, has recently been carried on, growing out of certain views of Wilmanns.<sup>2</sup> Starting from the fact that documents from the time before 1160 are wanting, he has denied the existence of any such poetry previous to that year. Burdach<sup>3</sup> and Richard M. Meyer<sup>4</sup> have tried to controvert this opinion by the use of various arguments, without appealing, however, to the songs in the Limburger Chronik. Now, could it be proved that the poetry which has been handed down to us in our chronicle was in no way influenced by the development of artistic lyrical poetry in the thirteenth century, could we further show that a close relation exists between the contents, the metrical forms, the poetical expressions, etc., of our songs and the beginnings of the Minnepoesie as represented in "Minnesangs Frühling" as well as in the Volkslieder of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, then I believe we shall be justified in drawing a conclusion as to the age of German Volkspoesie in general.

To this end it does not suffice that we have the assurance of the author of our Chronik: "item zu diser zit da sang und pfeif man dit lit overalle," or "in allen Duschen landen."

It is necessary to fix the position and character of the Limburger Chronik among similar documents of the time, and to ascertain, above all, whether its author probably composed the songs himself while in his poetical vanity he gave them the attribute of popularity.

The Chronicle of Limburg belongs to that class of historical literature which had a rich development at the close of the thirteenth and during the fourteenth century, owing to a deeper and more widespread interest in historical matters as it is found especially among the citizens of the great German cities.<sup>5</sup> They

<sup>1</sup> I 115.

<sup>2</sup> Wilmanns, Leben Walther v. d. Vogelw. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Zeitsch. f. d. A. XXVII 343 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. XXIX 121 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. O. Lorenz, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter. Wattenbach, Geschichtsquellen.

are not men of broad views and profound learning, like the historians in the times of the Hohenstaufen, who now try to supply the demand of readers. Recruiting their ranks mostly from the lower nobility, from the citizens and the clergy, they make it their chief object to be popular. And corresponding with the course of German politics, with the decline of imperial power and the rise of territorial interests, we find that most of these historical documents are local histories, chronicles of cities. At that time we scarcely meet with an attempt to write a general history of the world or to penetrate by deeper reasoning the course of historical events. But while they betray a charming *naïveté* in the absence of thoughts, these chroniclers cannot be called free from certain *motifs*. Historical legends, which to a great extent form the charm of the earlier historians, are almost entirely wanting, and whenever they are introduced, it is done, not with the naïve credulity of earlier centuries, but with the consciousness of an intention to produce certain effects. Being thus the representatives of a very prosaic view of the world, they did well to choose the form of prose for their productions, for they are intolerable as soon as they try to become poetical. But as writers of German prose, which assured them great popularity, they deserve a high place in the history of German literature. The great development of almost all poetical forms during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries scarcely left space for the use of prose as it had been cultivated in the latter part of the tenth century in the monastery of St. Gall. It was relegated to the position of the sole medium of expression of theological literature, for the popular form of sermons, or the more scientific writings which contain the philosophical speculations of the mystics. A close relation between the language of bodies of laws like the "Sachsenspiegel" and "Schwabenspiegel" may also be observed.

The gradual turning toward a more prosaic view of the world, the favored use of popular German prose, and the awakening interest in historical studies are principally due, however, to the two great orders, the Franciscans and Dominicans. It was only natural that the Church should start a movement of reaction against the spirit of a time which resembles very much that of the classical times of Lessing, Kant, Goethe and Schiller. Poetry which, to the middle of the eleventh century, had been cultivated almost exclusively by the clergy, had become an ethical power in the hands of knights and burghers. Their ideals were independent

of those of the Church, they preached religious tolerance, and in Walther von der Vogelweide the Pope had one of his most dangerous enemies. As the great mass of the German clergy had no influence upon their own people, the Pope in his reactionary efforts very prudently made use of those orders, whose original purpose was the conversion of heretics not only in South France but also in Germany. For here, too, the belief of the Church had been dangerously shaken, and stories of saints and miracles found no believers, according to a contemporary, unless the preacher added carefully the exact place and time where such miraculous occurrences had taken place. It seems that clerical astuteness speedily took this practical hint, and we soon see them collecting accounts of all kinds of events, historical and miraculous, thus producing an endless literature of more or less value. The Franciscans, who gave Germany some of its greatest preachers, made these collections mostly for practical homiletic use; they were the arsenals from which the monks took arms for attacking the gay, worldly life in the castles, the cities and the country. The Dominicans, on the other hand, who, from the beginning, show more scientific tendencies, manifest the same spirit in their treatment of history. The order which produced scholastics like Albertus Magnus, the celebrated teacher of Thomas Aquinas, of whom jealous Franciscans said, "Albertus ex asino factus est philosophus et ex philosopho asinus"—the same order created a rich historical literature bearing the character of compilations like many of their theological works. Like the Franciscans they either wrote themselves chronicles of cities, or persuaded others to do so. A brief sketch of the literary life and the tendencies of these orders was necessary in order to characterize the author of our chronicle, who, as we shall find, also belonged to the clergy.

Various accounts of the authorship of the Chronicle of Limburg were given by the different publishers, until Arthur Wyss, in his excellent little treatise, proved beyond doubt that it was written by Tilemann Elhem von Wolfhagen. From several documents recently reprinted in Wyss's large edition of our chronicle, it appears that Tilemann was town clerk of the city of Limburg from 1370-98. From the same source we learn that he belonged to the diocese of Treves. Wolfhagen, therefore, a village not far from Cassel, is evidently his native place, and he was born there probably about the year 1347; for, in chapter 13 of the chronicle, he says, "You shall know, everything that happened between 1347 and 1402 has

happened in my days, and I have through God's help seen it with my eyes and heard from my childhood until now." Although an ecclesiastic brought up in one of the monastic schools of Maintz, he calls himself in the barbarous Latin of his time *clericus uxoratus*, the name of his wife being Grede. It is evident, therefore, that he was not an ordained priest, but had changed his original calling to that of an imperial notary and town clerk of Limburg.

Much more than these few scanty notes upon his life, however, may be gained from Tilemann's work, in order to draw a picture of the man. Frequent quotations from Aristotle, Cato, the *Corpus Juris* and the Bible show that he was a man well trained in the scholastic learning of his time. His mention of Johannes Buridan (1327-50), the pupil of Occam and inventor of the "ass between two bundles of hay," probably serves to show that Tilemann, for a time at least, had studied under the great philosopher in Paris. Remembering the picture of the theological world of his time, the motives and efforts of the Dominicans and Franciscans, we must, however, say that Tilemann represents a great exception. While he shares their interest in the writing of history, while he still feels himself an ecclesiastic and condemns certain heretical movements as directed against the Church and the Pope, he does not share their fanatic hatred of poetry and worldly education. Nowhere in the chronicle do we find even a trace that he was led by theological motives or followed the tendencies of the other chroniclers, and only from a few passages can we infer that he consulted other historical sources.

He relates, according to his own confession, what he has seen and heard; the contents of the chronicle are, therefore, taken from life, and to this it owes its lasting charm. We hear not only of lesser or greater political events, but he tells us also of the weather in different years, the harvest, the quality of the wine, and of abnormal births. From him we learn of one of the first historical strikes, of social and religious movements; and to him we owe most valuable accounts of important paintings, as well as of the costumes not only of men but also of women—for he was a married man. His principal interest, however, seems to have been concentrated upon the arts of music and poetry. And while we may safely conclude that a man of such wide interests, that such a keen and faithful observer, can never have gone through the school of one of the fanatical orders above mentioned, but rather belongs to the old conservative class of ecclesiastics who joined

the knights and citizens in their gay, poetic life, we must still ask how it is possible to meet with such a unique personality in this century? Comparing other chronicles with a view to the poetry which they contain, we frequently find songs scattered here and there, but they are always chosen to serve some purpose of the author; they are introduced mostly as stylistic embellishments. Tilemann's collection, on the other hand, appears to have been made entirely for its own sake, and, furthermore, betrays so much intimate knowledge of poetry and music as an art that we cannot help supposing that its author was either an exceptionally highly educated amateur or a poet himself, probably belonging to the newly arising school of mastersingers. We know that in Maintz there existed one of the first of these schools, which showed, according to a contemporary (cf. Germ. XV 200), a decidedly conservative spirit, in opposition to the newly invented measures and melodies of other schools. Is it not possible that Tilemann, besides receiving his theological training in Maintz, may also have acquired the poetical education of that mastersinger school? A close examination of his style and of those poetical passages which doubtless belong to him, will perhaps give us a satisfactory answer.

It cannot be denied that Tilemann's style, although keeping within the typical forms of such chronicles, is remarkably German in its character, and free from the influence of Latin style which has continued to corrupt German prose down to our own time. The tranquillity of epic objectiveness is spread over the chronicle in general, and several descriptions of persons might find a place in any great epic poem. Relating the contest which the city of Limburg had with the Knight Cune, *i. e.* Konrad von Falkenstein, the protector of Maintz and Treves, he describes him in the following manner: "Item nu saltu wissen phyzonomien unde gestalt hern Conen vurgenant, want ich in dicke gesehen unde geprufet han in sime wesen unde in mancher siner manirunge. He was ein herlich stark man von libe unde wol gepersoniret unde gross von allem gelune, unde hatte ein gross heupt mit eime struben widem brunen krulle, ein breit antlitz mit pussenden backen, ein sharp menlich gesichte, einen bescheiden mont mit gleszen etzlicher masse dicke; die nase was breit, mit gerumeden naselochern, die nase was ime mitten nider gedrucket; mit eime grossen kinne unde mit einer hohen stirne, unde hatte auch ein gross brost unde rodelfare under sinen augen, unde stont uf sinen beinen als ein lewe, unde hatte gutliche geberde gen sinen frunden, unde wanne dass he zornig was, so

pusseeden unde floderten ime sine backen unde stonden ime herlichen unde wiſlichen unde nit obel."

While Tilemann shows in passages like this that he had certain poetical gifts, he does not betray the same faculty in his verses. The latter are, with one exception, translations of quotations from the Bible and ancient writers, and appear to be made according to the prescription, "Reim' dich oder ich fress' Dich." Thus he translates a sentence of Aristotle: "Amicus est consolativus amico visione et sermone: Ein frunt sal sime frunde trostlich sin unde dun dass mit rede und gesicht shin." Speaking of the locusts which appeared in Germany in 1362 and did great damage, he quotes the 46th verse of the LXXVII psalm, "Et dedit erugini fructus eorum et laborum eorum locustis," and translates: "Di rupen sollent ire fruchte leben, arbeit der lute ist den Haunschrecken gegeben."

Indeed, such verses may pass for the poetical pastime of an amateur who is trying his skill in hours of leisure, but nobody will find in them the traces of a poetical genius. And even at a more important occasion, when Tilemann evidently is so deeply agitated that he asks his readers to pray to God for him, and his local patriotism takes the form of poetry, his verses do not rise above the level of rhymed prose. The independence of Limburg had been at stake after the death of the princes of Limburg, and the Archbishop of Treves, in whose diocese the city was situated, came with many knights and soldiers in order to take possession. Before doing this, however, he called the city council together and asked them what rights and privileges the Archbishop might, in their opinion, claim. But instead of being frightened, the head of the council, the burgomaster Boppe, gave such sharp and legal answers that the Archbishop was astonished, and refrained from touching the independence of Limburg. Full of joy and just pride, Tilemann then writes the following lines:

"Daran gedenket, it jungen unde ir alden  
dass ir mit wiſheit moget behalden  
uwer lip, gut unde ere  
dass ist uwern kinden gute mere."

It would certainly be a charitable injustice towards Tilemann were we, after having examined the poetry which he claims as his own, to suspect him of having written any of the beautiful songs occurring in the latter part of the chronicle. There is every reason for believing that he is not the composer of any one of the songs

which he tells us were so popular, at various times, in Germany. Nor do passages in which he shows his knowledge of the technical language of the mastersingers prove, as we shall see later when we treat of the metrical peculiarities of these poems, that he must have practised the art of poetry to any further extent than that which has been indicated above.

Looking over the whole collection of poems contained in the Chronicle of Limburg, we may divide it into three different classes : (1) Poetry showing the influence of the declining Minnepoesie ; (2) Religious poetry ; (3) Popular songs.

There is only one poem in the chronicle which strictly belongs to the first class, and which bears the name of its author, Herr Reinhard von Westerburg.

This knight frequently appears in historical documents of that time, not only figuring in many of those fights in which the lesser knights constantly indulged, but also as a favored follower of Emperor Ludwig of Bavaria. He also must have enjoyed great fame as a poet, besides being a very jovial, witty and wild fellow. We possess a beautiful characterization of him by one of his contemporaries, contained in a poem of a MS of the fifteenth century, which was formerly in the possession of W. Grimm, and is now to be found in the Royal Library of Berlin (cf. *Zeitschrift f. d. A.* XIII 366 ff.). The author of this poem represents himself as walking in the woods, where he finds an elderly but still handsome lady. As she does not answer his greeting, he takes her by the hand, whereupon she tells him that thirty years ago she had founded a school for the purpose of teaching young knights the rules of honor and drawing them from the pool of disgrace. Tired of the great mass of knights, she had selected from their numbers twelve who had now developed into the bloom of knighthood and were ready to be dismissed, and she herself needed rest. Here the poet interrupts her, and proposes that she should continue her school. She asks him to name some knights whom she might take. This he does, but when mentioning Reinhard von Westerburg he cautiously adds, "He is a little wild and needs your training."

The story which Tilemann relates is entirely in accordance with this, and furnishes a delightful illustration of Reinhard's wildness. He says : " Item da man schreip dusent druhundert unde siben unde vierzig jar, da worden di von Cobelenze jemerlichen irslagen unde nider geworfen bi Grensauwe unde bliben ir doit hundert unde zwene unde sibenzig man unde worden ir auch darzu vil

gefangen unde dass det Reinhart, herre zu Westerburg. Unde der selbe Reinhart was gar ein kluger ritter von libe, von sinne unde von gestalt, unde reit keiser Ludewigen ser nach unde sang' unde machte he dit lit :

' Ob ich durch si den hals zubreche,  
wer reche mir den schaiden dan ?  
so enhette ich nimans der mich reche ;  
ich bin ein ungefrochter man.  
' Darumb so muss ich selber warten,  
wi ez mir gelegen si.  
Ich enhan nit trostes von der zarten,  
si ist irs gemudes fri.  
Wel si min nit, di werde reine,  
so muss ich wol orlaup han.  
Uf ir genade achte ich kleine,  
sich, daz lasse ich si vorstan.'

Da der vurgenant keiser Ludewig daz lit gehorte, darumb so strafte he den herren von Westerburg unde saide, he wolde ez der vrouwen gebessert haben. Da nam der herre von Westerburg eine kurze zit unde saide, he wolde den frauwen hesseren unde sang daz lit :

' In jammers noden ich gar vurdreven bin  
durch ein wif so minnecliche,' etc.

Da sprach Keiser Ludewig: 'Westerburg, du hast uns nu wol gebessert.' "

It is evident that Reinhart's poem belongs to that healthy opposition which seems to have begun even in the time of Walther v. d. Vogelweide, and which is generally called the decline of Minnepoesie. The conditions upon which the latter was based were too unnatural, the circles in which it moved too narrow, to assure it a longer life. For that sickly romantic admiration until recently prevailing in Germany and elsewhere, which saw in those knights the true representatives of *die gute, alte Zeit*, and adored them as the incarnation of *Zucht und Ehrbarkeit*, has fortunately passed away. While we fully acknowledge the beauties of many of their productions, we cannot help seeing in their constant groaning, whining and lamenting something extremely unknightly, especially as it was meant for married women, and had but one aim in view, the immorality of which cannot be denied, even if we call it, in Walther's elegant language, "halsen triuten bigelegen." The opposition, however, was not caused by such ethical considerations. Very soon the more sensible minds began to see the comical

element in the relation between knight and lady; above all, they began to feel that the fundamental idea upon which the whole nature of Minnepoesie rested was as unnatural as it was wrong. The idea that man is the servant of woman had not grown upon German soil, and in spite of all apparent flatteries, contained a very low conception of the woman, if we remember the real aim of this servitude.

It is very interesting to follow the development of the opposition, a history of which we do not yet possess. Very significantly, it is inaugurated by that poet in whom the sensual element of Minnepoesie reached its climax, and who afterwards became for this reason the hero of a popular legend, by *Tannhäuser*. He ridicules Minnepoesie by enumerating impossible things which the lady in whose "service" he is, required of him. And as he already praises the simple peasant girl whose love is won more easily than that of a lady in the higher circles, *Neidhard von Reuenthal* makes the villages near Vienna the scene of his love adventures, and while preserving the air of a minnesinger, brings about highly ludicrous situations. Their followers, *Steinmar*, *Gottfried von Neisen* and others go still further by scorning the unnatural feeling itself. *Steinmar* even compares the throbbing of his love-sick heart to the jumping of a pig in a bag (*Als ein swin in einem sacke vert mîn herze hin und dar*). But I have searched in vain in the minnesingers of that period to find a single example in which the poet addressed his ridicule to the lady herself as *Reinhard von Westerburg* does here. The ties of etiquette and tradition requiring the highest respect for the lady, were too strong yet, even at this late period, and it was because *Tilemann* felt them to be broken that he mentioned *Reinhard's* poem. This offence against tradition, which really meant the dissolution of the whole fabric of Minnepoetry, was felt still more keenly by the representative of conservatism, whose glory was based upon the splendor of knighthood by the emperor. For this reason he reprimands *Reinhard*, asking him to turn from his former course; and for this reason *Reinhard* assumes the old, worn-out, love-sick attitude of a minnesinger, behind which we can after all not help seeing the wild rogue.

Of the same importance which *Reinhard's* poem has for the history of Minnepoetry are *Tilemann's* accounts of the development of religious poetry. The same clear, observing mind which, either by instinctive interest or from scientific motives, noted a

most valuable turn in secular poetic art, has preserved us also an interesting source of knowledge in the field of sacred hymnology. Through Hoffmann von Fallersleben's diligent researches we know that the German church hymn is not entirely a new creation of Luther's.<sup>1</sup> Long before him the German spirit had revolted against the stupid inactivity with which Roman priests and the Roman liturgy had oppressed it. We can trace how the people, beginning with a few senseless vowels added to the strange *Kyrie eleison*, which they were allowed to sing, gradually created a German church hymn, much to the dislike of the Roman clergy. We owe it to the hate and persecutions of the latter that most of these songs were lost. The few which we still possess of the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, especially those addressed to the Virgin Mary, are filled with the deepest and most sublime religious feeling, and some songs which the people sang at Easter and Pentecost, such as "Christ ist erstanden" and "Komm, heilger Geist," are still jewels of our present hymnals. Religious sects especially, as e. g. the mystics, which developed a highly spiritual life, cultivated religious poetry, and thus we find that the specimens preserved by Tilemann also belong to one of the religious movements of the fourteenth century. For, excepting the century of the Reformation, no other period was so deeply agitated by religion as the fourteenth century; and in many respects it may be compared to our present time. Not only do we find there the first beginning of great socialistic movements in Germany, but we also meet with the mania of our own time as well, the 'Antisemitentum,' the 'Judenhetze,' and even with the premonition of our Salvation Army, the Flagellants, among whom originated the songs of which we are about to treat.

Owing to the few and, for the most part, very imperfect and prejudiced sources of information afforded by contemporary writers, our knowledge of the whole movement is extremely limited. Although it has been proved by Haeser ("Lehrbuch der Gesch. der Medicin") and Hecker ("Die grossen Volkskrankheiten des Mittelalters") that this movement was caused by the so-called Black Death, mainly a disease of the lungs, which had been imported from Asia, and which swept through Europe from the Black Sea to Spain, devouring millions of people, we do not know its exact connection with the persecution of the Jews and

<sup>1</sup> Hoffmann von Fallersleben, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes bis auf Luthers Zeit.

the geographical route of the Flagellants. Recent investigation, however, has shown that the order of events which is usually accepted, viz., Black Death—Persecution of the Jews—Flagellants, has to be changed, for Germany at least, into Persecution of the Jews—Flagellants—Black Death.<sup>1</sup> The news of the approaching plague was a welcome pretext for getting rid of the Jews, who, as Roscher ("Ansichten der Volkswirtschaft") has proved, were hated as the possessors of money and as public extortioners. Malice, stupidity and religious fanaticism manufactured the story that they had poisoned the wells, and in less than one year all the Jews scattered from Cologne to Austria were killed. The words 'Judenmord,' 'Judenbrand,' 'Judenschlacht' are technical terms in the chronicles, which find it quite natural that in Strassburg 2000 Jews were burned at one time *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*. One chronicler remarks (Diessenhofen) *crederem finem Hebreorum advenisse*, while another writer coolly concludes *requiescant in inferno* (Chronicum Lampetrinum). We have sufficient proof that the Flagellants, who appear simultaneously with these persecutions, frequently instigated them in the places at which they arrived with their processions.

Two great periods are to be distinguished in the history of this peculiar fanatical movement. Driven by an agonizing fear of the approaching death, which no human art or power could stay, superstitious people, seeing the wrath and judgment of God in the pest, organized in different parts of Germany a religious order composed of those who thought to be able to reconcile the wrath of God by punishing and torturing themselves. The impression which they created wherever they appeared was overpowering and heartrending, for a genuine religious enthusiasm seemed to break forth like a revelation from mysterious depths. As Tilemann reports, knights, citizens and peasants joined the new order. Closener, the chronicler of Strassburg, writes: "Whenever the Flagellants scourged themselves, then the greatest crowds assembled and the greatest weeping was to be witnessed, for they believed everything to be true." And another writer, Hervord, says: *Cor lapideum esset quod talia sine lacrimis posset accipere.* It was in this first time, when they were welcomed everywhere and still filled with the spirit of repentance, that our hymns were composed.

Soon, however, we notice a great change in public opinion as

<sup>1</sup> R. Hoeniger, *Der schwarze Tod in Deutschland*.

well as among the Flagellants themselves. Notwithstanding all the praying, singing and scourging, the plague appeared and swept away millions and millions of people. We must not be surprised that the belief of the public was shaken, that it began to look upon the whole spectacle as a pious fraud. The Flagellants themselves seem to have felt their failing, and in order to preserve themselves they directed their agitation against the clergy, for they were sure this would not fail to make them popular. For a time it seems as if they had successfully calculated upon the public hatred of the depraved clergy. The movement assumes immense proportions; it spreads over all Germany; even women and children become Flagellants. Again they are seen to change their policy. Having filled their ranks with the outcasts of society, they begin to show socialistic and anarchical tendencies. Long before they had ceased to be an element of great ethical strength and influence. While in the earlier period their members had not dared to speak to women, a chronicler now writes: *transiverunt eciam in similibus turmis mulieres et virgines que, sicut audivi, nonnuncquam plenis, salva reverencia, gremiis redierunt*, thus also foreshadowing the frequent elopements of our Salvation Army. They caused a second general persecution of the Jews; they entered and pillaged villages and cities, and finally threatened a complete overthrow of society. A final and radical change in public opinion now follows. Papal and imperial power unite for their destruction. In the same dry words with which the chroniclers spoke of the burning of the Jews they now relate the general slaughter of the Flagellants.

It is another proof of the impartiality of Tilemann that, although he shared the popular condemnation of the Flagellants, he has nevertheless written an accurate account of their first appearance.

We fortunately possess another description of the movement, entirely independent from Tilemann's, which not only verifies the statements of the latter, but will also assist us in obtaining a clear picture of all the ceremonies and processions accompanied by the singing of hymns. It was written by Fritsche (Friedrich) Closener, a contemporary of Tilemann living in Strassburg, and likewise an ecclesiastic and chronicler of his native city.<sup>1</sup> The Flagellants generally marched in troops consisting of one to three hundred members, who had pledged themselves, before entering the brother-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lorenz, *Geschichtsquellen*, p. 33; K. Hegel, *Die Chroniken der deutschen Städte*, Vol. 8, p. 3 (Einleitung).

hood, to observe strictly its regulations during the thirty to thirty-four days of the procession. As soon as they approached a city or a village they formed a line, following two by two the bearers of precious silk and velvet flags. They were clad in very plain clothes; upon their cloaks and hats red crosses were fastened. And while the church bells were rung to greet them, they marched to the church singing, according to Tilemann's version, the following song:

Ist dise bedefart so here  
 Crist fur selber zu Jherusalem  
 und furte ein cruze in siner hant.  
 Nu helf uns der heilant!

As Tilemann relates, the hymn had been composed for this special purpose, and was used in later times during the processions, "wanne man di heiligen treit." It has been preserved by Closener<sup>1</sup> in a more perfect form, and it is interesting to observe in this song, as well as in the others recorded by Closener, the constant changes which every genuine folksong has to undergo.

Nû ist die bettevert sô hér  
 Crist reit selber gen Jherusalem;  
 er fürt ein krütze an siner hant.  
 nû helf uns der heilant!

Nû ist die bettevert sô guot.  
 hilf uns, herre, durch din heiliges bluot,  
 daz du an dem krütze vergossen hast,  
 und uns in dem ellende gellossen hast.

Nû ist die strôsze alsô breit  
 die uns zu unsere lieben frowen treit  
 in unsere lieben frowen lant.  
 nû helfe uns der heilant!

Wir sullen die busze an uns nemen,  
 daz wir gote deste bas gezemen  
 aldort in sines vatters rich.  
 des bitten wir dich sündler alle gelich.  
 so bitten wir den vil heiligen Crist  
 der alle der welte gewaltig ist.

As soon as they had entered the church they kneeled down and sang:

Jhesus wart gelabet mit gallen  
 des sollen wir an sin cruze vallen. (Tilemann.)

<sup>1</sup> Cf. K. Hegel, *Chroniken*, VIII 105; L. Uhland, *Volkslieder*, II 824; W. Wackernagel, *Lesebuch*, I 1246.

Then they threw themselves on the ground, stretching out their arms in the form of a cross. In this position they remained until their precentor sang :

Nû hebent üf die üwern hende  
daz got dis grosze sterben wende. (Closener.)

After the first part of their exercises was thus ended, the inhabitants of the city or village invited them home and "büttentz in wol" (fed them). The principal performance, the scourging, generally took place twice a day either in a churchyard or in some large open place. Thither they marched in the same order in which they had entered the church, formed a circle, took off their shoes and uncovered the upper part of their bodies. Hereupon they lay down on the ground, indicating by their positions the different sins which they had committed. The adulterer, e. g. placed himself on his face, the murderer on his back, the perjurer held up three fingers, etc. One of the leaders, having stepped over one of the brothers as he lay on the ground, touched him with his whip and said :<sup>1</sup>

Stant üf durch der reinen martel êre,  
Und hüt dich vor der sünden mère.

Thus he went through the whole circle, and whoever had been touched followed him in the same ceremony until all had risen. Now another circle was formed into which the precentors stepped, intoning the second long hymn, while the brothers two by two went around the circle scourging themselves until the blood flowed. In Tilemann's version the song begins thus :

Tredet herzu, wer bussen welle,  
so fihen wir di heissen helle.  
Lucifer ist bose geselle,  
wen he hat,  
mit beche er in labet.

This was evidently the most important hymn in these bloody exercises. In a more perfect, but still very corrupt form, we have it preserved not only by Closener, but also in a Low German version.<sup>2</sup> Almost the same thoughts and many similar expressions

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Closener, p. 107 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ph. Wackernagel, Das deutsche Kirchenlied, II 336.

occur in a song of the French Flagellants,<sup>1</sup> which points to the international character of the movement as well as to a common source of the various forms of this hymn. After it had been sung the Flagellants again kneeled down and sang :

Jhesus wart gelabet mit gallen,  
Des sollen wir an ein cruze fallen. (Tilemann.)

Again they threw themselves on the ground, remaining there for a while until the precentors began :

Nū hebent ūf die uwern hende,  
das got dis grosze sterben wende.  
Nū hebent ūf die uwern arme,  
das sich got über uns erbarme.  
Jhēsus, durch diner namen drie,  
Du mach uns, herre, vor sünden frie!  
Jhēsus, durch dīne wunden rōt  
Behüt uns vor dem gehen tōt. (Closener.)

<sup>1</sup> Or, avant, entre nous tuit frère  
Batons noz charvingues bien fort,  
En remembrant la grant misère  
De Dieu et sa piteuse mort,  
Qui fut pris de la gent amère  
Et vendus et trahi à tort :  
Et battu sa char vierge et clère ;  
Ou nom de ce, batons plus fort.

Loons Dieu et batons noz pis,  
Et en la douerce remembrance  
De ce que tu feus abeuvrez  
Avec le crueux cop de la lance,  
D'asil o fiel fut destrampez.  
Alons à genoux par penance ;  
Loons Dieu, vos bras estandez ;  
Et en l'amour de sa souffrance  
Cheons jus en croix à tous lez.

Batons noz pis, batons no face.  
Tendons noz bras, de grant vouloir  
Dieux qui nous a fait, nous préface  
Et nous doint de cieux le manoir.  
Et gart tous ceulx qu'en ceste place  
En pitié nous viennent veoir  
Jhēsus ainsi comme devant.  
—(Leroux de Lincy, Recueil de Chants histor. franc. I 233.)

Then they stretched out their arms in the form of a cross, and beating their breasts, sang :

Nû slaget uch sêre  
durch Cristes êre.  
Dorch Got so lasset di hoffart faren,  
so wel sich Got ober uns irbarmen.

This last song, while not recorded by Closener, is given after Tilemann. It was doubtless used wherever the Flagellants appeared, since it is frequently mentioned by contemporary and later writers. Its Dutch version runs as follows :

Nu slaet u seer  
door Christus eer  
door God so laet die sonden meer.

An Austrian chronicle (1025-1282), which relates of the earliest Flagellants in 1260, mentions it in the following sentence : *Mulieres quoque in domibus simili modo faciendo, et illum cantum psallebant :*

Ir slahrt iuch sêre  
in cristes êre.  
durch got so lat die sünde mère.

Hence it is highly probable that not only parts of songs, but whole hymns, and perhaps even many ceremonies, had been preserved by tradition for nearly a century. With the singing of the hymn just quoted the first part of these dramatic exercises closed. A second and third procession and scourging now followed, during which the continuation of "Tredet herzu, wer bussen welle" was sung.<sup>1</sup> The reading of a long letter which, as they pretended, had

<sup>1</sup> Maria stuont in grossen nöten  
Do siu ir liebes kint sach toeten,  
Ein swerte ir durch die sele sneit. (Cf. Stabat mater.)  
Daz lo dir, sunder, wesen leit.  
Des hilf uns lieber herre got,  
des bitten wir dich durch dinen tot.  
Jhesus riefe in hiemelriche  
sinen engeln allen geliche,  
er sprach zuo in vil senedeclichen :  
die cristenheit wil mir entwichen,  
des wil ich lan die welt zergan,  
des wissent sicher, one wan.  
dovor behüt uns, herre got,  
des bitten wir dich durch dinen tot.

been sent from heaven by Christ, usually closed the services.

Maria bat irn sun den süßen :  
liebes kint, lo sü dir büssen  
so wil ich schicken, daz sü müssen  
beseren sich. des bit ich dich,  
vil liebes kint, des gewer du mich.

des bitten wir sunder och alle gelich  
Welich frowe oder man ire e nuo brechen  
daz wil got selber an si rechen :  
swebel, bech und och die gallen  
güssset der tüfel in sie alle.

Furwar sie sint des duvels bot.  
dovor behüt uns, herre got,  
des bitten wir dich durch dinen tot.

Ir mordere, ir strosroubere,  
uch ist die rede enteil zuo swere,  
ir wellent uch über nieman erbarn,  
des mussent ir in die helle varn.

dovor behüt uns, herre got,  
des bitten wir dich durch dinen tot.

O we, ir armen wuocherere,  
dem lieben got sint ir unmere.  
du lihest ein marg al umbe pfunt,  
daz zühet dich in der helle grunt,  
des bistu iemer me verlorn,  
derzuo so bringet dich gottes zorn

dovor behüt uns, etc.  
Die erde erbidemet, sich klübent die steine  
ir herten hertzen, ir sullen weinen,  
weinent tongen—mit den ougen.

schlahent uch sere—durch Cristes ere.  
durch (in) vergiessen wir unser bluot,  
daz si uns fur die sünde guot.

daz hilf uns lieber herre got, etc.

Der den fritag nüt envastet  
und den süntag nüt enrastet,  
zwar der müsse in der helle pin  
eweklich verloren sin.

dovor behüt uns, etc.

Die e, die ist ein reines leben,  
die hat got selber uns gegeben.  
ich rat frowen und ir mannen,  
daz ir die hochfart lasset dannen.  
durch got so laut die hochfart varn,  
so wil sich got über uns erbarn.

des hilf uns, etc.

Tilemann, finally, has preserved us the first strophes of two hymns which they intoned on leaving the cities and villages :

O herre vader Jh̄esu Christ,  
want du ein herre alleine bist,  
der uns die sunde mach vurgeben,  
un gefriste uns, herre, ūf besser leben,  
das wir beweinen d̄nen d̄t!  
Wir klagen dir, herre alle unse n̄t, etc.

Or :

Ez ging sich unse frauwe, kyrieleison,  
des morgens in dem dauwe, alleluia.  
Gelobet si Maria!  
Da begente ir ein junge, kyrieleison,  
sin bart war ime entsprungen, alleluia.  
Gelobet si Maria! etc.

It was necessary to give a full description of the ceremonies and songs of the Flagellants, in order to illustrate the manner in which Tilemann recorded poetry in his chronicle. Comparing his account with that of Closener and other sources, it will be observed that, although Closener has a more complete text, Tilemann has noted several songs of essential importance for the understanding of the Flagellant movement, which do not occur in Closener. The reason why Tilemann usually does not report more than one stanza of the various hymns is to be found in the fact that they are of interest to him only as newly arisen forms of metrical and musical production. Several times he takes occasion to emphasize that the hymns or "leisen" (kyrieleison), as he calls them, had been composed at this time (der leise ward da gemachet) or belonged exclusively to the Flagellants (ire leisen). Finally, he says: "item du salt wissen, daz dise vurgeschreben leisen alle worden gemachet unde gedicht in der geiselnfart, unde enwas der leisen keine vur gehort." Although Tilemann is mistaken here in regard to the verses "Nu slaget uch sere," which were known as early as 1260, his remark characterizes the manner in which he observed newly arising poetical phenomena. His treatment of these religious hymns will, of course, help to throw light on his account of the remaining popular poetry, as we shall find later. An investigation as to the common source of all the Flagellant poetry is not undertaken in this paper. It is highly probable, however, that it is to be found in Italy, where we meet with the earliest indications of the Flagellant movement in 1260; and that,

following the geographical route of the order, it became by translation and tradition the basis of the Flagellant poetry in the various countries.<sup>1</sup>

JULIUS GOEBEL.

<sup>1</sup>A proof for the latter supposition may be found in a passage from a chronicle quoted by Hoffmann, *Gesch. des d. Kirchenlieds*, p. 132 (*Chronicon Pulkavae. Monum. hist. Boem. T. III*, p. 232): *Eodem anno flagellatorum quaedam secta suboritur, qui velantes capita more claustralium ad cingulum denudati flagellis in extremitatibus nodos habentibus, fortissime se caedebant, quorum etiam quidam processiones, stationes, venias et genuflexiones fecerunt mirabiles, secundum distinctiones linguarum cantantes.*

### III.—THE AGON OF THE OLD COMEDY.

An ancient Greek tragedy may be compared to a discourse the object of which is to inculcate some moral or to explain and illustrate some divine law—such a discourse, for instance, as a sermon based upon a “text.” A comedy of the old period, on the other hand, is like a debate on a more or less definitely formulated question. This question may be a practical one of a moral or political nature, or it may be merely ideal or purely fanciful. In comedies of the former kind there is a contest, earnest and serious, sometimes bitter, between two opposing principles; in those of the latter class the contest is only an outward form, owing its existence to custom.<sup>1</sup> It is not possible to draw the line sharply between the two kinds of comedy; but the Knights and the Clouds are separated by a wide gulf from the Birds and Ekklesiazousai.

There is another basis of classification that will be useful in the present discussion, and that is, the result of the contest. Just as in the tragedy (to use the word in its ordinary loose sense) the characters with whom we sympathize may succumb, as in the Antigone of Sophokles, or may triumph, as in his Elektra, so in comedy the good principle or the true doctrine may triumph, as in the Wasps, or it may succumb, as in the Clouds. In the latter case the dénouement always shows us that it is the unjust cause that has prevailed. The closing scene of the Clouds and the various warnings of the Choros are comparable to the utter desolation of Kreon and the ominous voice of Teiresias, while, so far as the play is concerned, the *δικαῖος λόγος* is as hopelessly undone as Antigone.

In the old comedy not only is each play a general contest, but at a certain point the representatives of the two opposing principles are brought face to face and have a regular debate under fixed rules and in prescribed form. This special contest forms the central part of the play, around which all else is grouped. What

<sup>1</sup> With the further development, leading to the new comedy, which had amusement for its object, and consequently gave up even the form of a contest, and with the causes that brought about this revolution, we are not here concerned.

precedes it is introductory to it; what follows flows from it. If we compare the whole play to a war, the scene under discussion is the decisive pitched battle. Before the battle there is organizing, manoeuvring, skirmishing; after the battle pursuing, capturing, negotiating; but during the all-important crisis of conflict everything else awaits the issue in breathless suspense. Sometimes, however, a great battle does not decide a war. This too finds its analogy in comedies. The conflict in the *Frogs* is called a *πόλεμος* (v. 1099), but at the end of the special contest the battle is pronounced indecisive and the continuation of hostilities is proclaimed. In the *Knights* there is a second conflict between the same antagonists (303 ff., 756 ff.). These features of the plays mentioned will be found to affect the form of the contests proper.

This scene, so characteristic of the old comedy, of course could not escape notice. Westphal (*Metrik der Griechen*, II, pp. 401 ff., 494) gives a clear statement of the form and nature of at least the chief portion of the contest, calling it a *Syntagma* (with *Antisyntagma*); but he treats it merely as an important passage of the *epeisodia*, without according to it the importance of a distinct subdivision of the play, quite co-ordinate with the *Parodos* and the *Parabasis*, though in his *Prolegomena zu Aeschylus Tragödien* (p. 97) he speaks of the typical form of the *Parabasis* and the *Antisyntagmatic* parts of the old comedy. Nesemann, in his *De Episodiis Aristophaneis*, 1872 (p. 43), calls it *comoediae nobilissimam partem eiusque robur*, and (p. 51) *totius comoediae partis scenicae umbilicum*, considers it a special form of the *epeisodion*, and devotes no less than eighteen pages out of his sixty-two to the *certatio*; whereas Arnoldt gives no further development to the subject, but even totally ignores it in his *Chorpartien bei Aristophanes*, although he bases part of his work upon that of Nesemann. Some of the editors, such as Kock and Teuffel, deem it sufficient to refer to Westphal's *Metrik*. The ancient scholiasts, as will be seen, were not entirely ignorant of the peculiar form of the contest.<sup>1</sup>

Such was the state of the subject when the writer, being engaged in the revision of Kock's *Clouds*, felt the inadequacy of the

<sup>1</sup> Zacher, in an elaborate review of Zieliński (*Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, 1886, Coll. 1546-1553, 1610-1615), cites also Bräuning, *Ueber Aristophanes Frieden*, Halle, 1874, S. 23 foll., and maintains, in the usual generous German way, that Zieliński has done nothing more than to set up a nomenclature for the whole and the parts.—B. L. G.

existing treatment, so far as it had come to his knowledge, and commenced the preparation of an article. The plan contemplated a careful study of Aristophanes and the fragments of all the comic poets, with a view to ascertaining the origin and tracing the history of the Agon—for it was at once decided to substitute this name for the “Syntagma” of Westphal. Names for the different parts of the Agon were adopted after correspondence and conference with scholars, and all the material was collected and prepared, except on one branch of the subject. It was discovered, namely, that three plays of Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, *Peace*, and *Thesmophoriazousai*, are entirely or virtually without an Agon, though all the other plays seemed to show that an Agon was an essential part of a comedy. While the causes of this anomaly were being sought and investigated, and in two of the three cases an explanation was well-nigh despaired of,<sup>1</sup> a new work appeared, *Die Gliederung der Altattischen Komoedie*, von Dr. Th. Zieliński—one of the most important works, in my opinion, that the form of the Greek drama has ever called forth. It treats not only of the analysis of the old comedy, but also of the manner of the whole performance of plays, and the relation of comedy to tragedy in respect to form. A review of the entire work will appear hereafter; this article precedes it because a full discussion of the Agon is necessary to a full appreciation of his theory. His work opens with an elaborate discussion of this subject, and he too uses the name “Agon.” The greater part of what I had prepared to say was found fully presented in this work, and that too from a more comprehensive point of view. In this article no attempt will be made to distinguish what is due to it. That is a matter of no interest to the reader, and I can only request him not to ascribe to Zieliński any errors that he may detect.

To obtain the clearest possible conception of the form and

<sup>1</sup> Nesemann had already attacked this subject. Of the *Peace* he says (p. 52): *Altercatio quidem iis inest nulla (Trygaeus enim nil facit nisi stupide interrogare [sic]): attamen quae fatur ibi Mercurius ab iis sententiis, quas in dictis certationibus solemus invenire, non sunt aliena.* Of the *Thesmophoriazusae* he says vaguely (p. 53): *Caussa cur sententiarum generalium contentio omnino desit, ex singulari fabulae conformatione videtur repetenda.* Of the *Acharnians* (p. 53): *Etiam in Acharnensisibus dicta certatio frustra quaeritur. Sed compensatur aliquatenus longa oratione (496-556) qua Dicaeopolis ad audentes versus omnes iis acerrime exprobrat perversitates, quibus rempublicam iam satis superque labefactatam in tot tantasque calamitates detruserint.*  
—B. L. G.

nature of the Agon would require a survey of all the plays in which it occurs, with attention specially directed to that feature. In the present article, however, only one play will be examined beyond the limits of the Agon, and merely an analysis of the Agon itself of other plays will be given, details being discussed only when they are of special interest.

For the general survey the most suitable comedy is the *Wasps*. The question discussed in this play relates to the advantages and disadvantages of litigation. It is a satire upon the litigiousness of the Athenians; but there is so little hope of practical results that in some respects the play inclines to the farcical.

*Prologos*, 1-229. Philokleon and Bdelykleon, whose names sufficiently characterize them, are father and son. The opening scene takes place before day at the house of Philokleon, who has been imprisoned at home by his son because he is afflicted with a mania: he is an extreme *φιληλιαστής*. He makes several vain attempts to elude the slaves that have been placed to guard him.

*Parodos*, 230-525. Philokleon's *συνδικασταί* have been summoned by Kleon to be on hand at an early hour provided with a three days' supply of wrath, for the purpose of prosecuting Laches, who has been discovered to possess some money. On their way they arrive, twenty-four in number, in front of the house of Philokleon. Here the boys who carry the lamps take advantage of a mud-puddle and give some trouble. The Chorus of dicasts, thus brought to a halt, sings a song, calling upon Philokleon to appear, and making various conjectures as to the cause of his unwonted remissness in failing to appear promptly. At last he is seen on top of the house, and attempts to let himself down with a rope. When in mid-air he is discovered, and a violent scene ensues. Bdelykleon and the two guards interrupt the proceeding. The dicasts dispatch the lamp-carriers to Kleon with news of the treason, and make a furious assault upon their opponents; that is, the Choreutai attempt to scale the Logeion. Other slaves are called to the rescue and the assailants are driven back, bewailing the ills of declining years. All parties come to parley. Bdelykleon repels with ridicule the charge of treason and attempted tyranny, and claims that he is only trying to make his father lead an honorable life free from all *δρθροφοιτοσυκοφαντοδικολατάρων τρόπων*, and proposes to show that the life that Philokleon has been leading is one of degradation and virtual slavery. At this the old man is indignant and maintains that he is virtually a supreme

ruler, and proposes to argue the case and leave it to the Choreutai. To this proposition, strange as it may seem, Bdelykleon readily agrees, and the way is prepared for the Agon. If the reader will examine the play itself he will see that the details of this scene and of the opening of the next are as formal and imply something as familiar as the preparations for a sacrifice or any other ceremony with which the people were familiar. This latter part of the Parodos is an introduction to the Agon. Such introductions sometimes form a separate scene, a *Proagon*, as Zieliński calls it. If we adhere to the simile of war, it may be called the *ἀκροβολισμός*.

Before proceeding further it is necessary to fix the nomenclature. That of Zieliński is radical, being conformed to his theory of the original "epirrhematic" composition of a comedy as compared with the "episodes" of a tragedy. While I accept nearly all of his conclusions, it must be confessed that some of the names, being transferred from the Parabasis (for which they were invented, probably by scholiasts), do not seem quite appropriate. In any case it would be premature to use his terminology before his justification of it can be presented. I therefore use one of the systems I had devised before his book appeared. Following an example set more than once by Aristophanes himself, I shall provisionally, and for the practical purposes of this article, adhere to the simile of a battle, without the slightest intention of giving a permanent name to any part of the Agon. The names I use, as will be seen, relate to the substance, and not the form, except in those places for which names are already current.

Αγών <sup>1</sup>	μίχη (Syzygy)	ἐπιχείρησις ("Syntagma")	παρακέλευσις	φύδη
			προσβολή	κέλευσμα
			ἀντιπαρακέλευσις	ἐπίθεσις
ἀπαλλαγή		ἀντιεπιχείρησις ("Antisyntagma")	ἀντιπρακέλευσις	ἐπίστασις
			ἀντιπροσβολή	ἀντιφύδη
			ἀντιδιάλυσις	ἀντικέλευσμα
		κρίσις	ἀντιπίθεσις	ἀντιστάσις
			διάλυσις	ἀντιπίστασις

<sup>1</sup> The words are transcribed in what follows. Of course only those belonging to the ultimate group, *ode*, *keleusma*, *epithesis*, etc., are used often. In these and all other *theatrical* terms the Greek form is retained. For the use of the word *ἀγών* in reference to the formal contest, cf. Vesp. 533; Ran. 785, 867, 873, 884; Nub. 956. It is not used technically, however. The *φύδη* might be called the *παραίνεις*, to complete the analogy.

The *prosbole* and *antiprosbole* are always composed of a tetrametric *epithesis* and hypermetric *epistasis*, the rhythm being anapaestic in both *prosbole* and *antiprosbole*, or anapaestic in the former and iambic in the latter, or vice versa, or iambic in both. Finally, the Agons of the later plays had no *antepicheiresis* ("Antisyntagma" of Westphal) at all. The classification of Agons will be based on these differences.

I. The *prosbole* and *antiprosbole* are both anapaestic.

1. The WASPS. *Agon*, 526-727.

(a) *Ode*, 526-545. The Chorus (first Hemichorion), warning Bdelykleon of the serious nature of the contest ( $\delta\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\bar{s}\ \gamma\bar{a}\bar{p}\ \bar{\omega}\bar{s}\ \bar{\sigma}\bar{o}\bar{l}\ \mu\bar{e}\bar{y}\bar{a}\bar{s}\ \bar{\epsilon}\bar{o}\bar{r}\bar{t}\bar{l}\bar{v}\ \bar{\alpha}\bar{y}\bar{a}\bar{v}$ ), exhorts him to use new and original arguments. The *ode* is several times interrupted by mesodic iambic tetrameters: the metre of the Parodos, but used nowhere else in the *Agon*.

(b) *Keleusma*, 546-7. The Chorus (i. e. Koryphaios as leader of first Hemichorion) bids Philokleon open the contest. Here, as always, the *keleusma* consists of two tetrameters, which regularly begin with  $\bar{a}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}\bar{a}$  (nearly always  $\bar{a}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}'$ ) and prescribe the metre for the *epithesis*.

(c) *Epithesis*, 548-618. Philokleon begins. The opening words,  $\kappa\bar{a}\bar{l}\ \bar{\mu}\bar{y}\bar{v}$ , though not so universally employed as the  $\bar{a}\bar{\lambda}\bar{\lambda}\bar{a}$  of the *keleusma*, are still very common. The old philheliast sets forth the power and glory of a dicast. Bdelykleon does not interrupt him much, but merely takes notes.

(d) *Epistasis*, 619-630. Here, as always, the *epistasis* is a hypermetron in the rhythm of the *epithesis*. A pause in the conflict is reached, and the assailant dresses his lines and secures his position.

(aa) *Antode*, 631-648. With the exception of a long-since recognized lacuna of two iambi (647), this corresponds metrically with the *ode*. There are also corresponding mesodic tetrameters. Perfect symmetry in the distribution of these will be attained if we give 643 to Bdelykleon. The Chorus (second Hemichorion) is ecstatic at the brilliant effort of their favorite. They feel as if they were sitting on a case in the Islands of the Blessed. Addressing themselves to Bdelykleon, they tell him he has a hard job on hand.

(bb) *Antikeleusma*, 649-650. This is regularly less formal than the *keleusma*. In the present instance its form is exceptionally

indirect; still it is a summons to begin, with a warning to be prepared for failure.

(cc) *Anteipithesis*, 650-718. This contains 69 verses against 71 in the *epithesis*. There is no evidence of corruption. The metrical correspondence, therefore, is not exact; whether there is any at all will be discussed at another time. The opening is not formal. Bdelykleon assumes the offensive. He portrays the slavery that Philokleon is imposing upon himself. The latter at first interrupts him with occasional objections, but finally is overcome, and prostrated, mentally and physically, by the overwhelming arguments.

(dd) *Antepistasis*, 719-724. There is no metrical correspondence with the *epistasis*. Bdelykleon, in the full consciousness of victory, relents and reviews the situation.

(e) *Krisis*, 725-8. The decision is a mere form, for Philokleon has already succumbed; but it reveals the fact that the Chorus also is converted. The *krisis*, uttered by or for the *entire* Chorus, consists regularly, as here, of four verses in the metre of the *antepithesis*. In the present case its last verse is connected grammatically with the first sentence of the next scene.

(f) *Dialysis*. This Agon has no formal *dialysis*; but, for the sake of completing the analysis, it may be stated that this part ordinarily consists of two triads of iambic trimeters (one triad uttered by each antagonist) in which the new situation growing out of the Agon is defined. It is not necessarily a peace, or even a truce, but it ends present hostilities. In this play it is expanded into an independent scene; hence the close grammatical nexus mentioned above.

The remaining Agons will be presented in more concise and less formal analyses.

## 2. The BIRDS. *Agon*, 451-628.

This is one of the farcical comedies in which the Agon is a contest only in form. Two men, with cooking utensils and other equipments, migrate to Birdland, and after an interview with the Eops<sup>1</sup> or hoopoe (who has retained speech along with other reminiscences of his previous human state, and has taught the other birds the use of language), propose a plan for the amelioration

<sup>1</sup> Zieliński uniformly calls the *ἴποψ* the "Kuckuck." This is probably due to Droysen's example, for the names *ἴποψ* and *κόκκυξ*, upupa and cuculus, Huppup (Wiedehopf) and Kuckuck, hoopoe and cuckoo, appear to designate the same pair of different birds.

of the condition of the birds. The Epopos fully endorses the proposed plan of founding a city in mid-air, and like a true Hellenic *βασιλεύς*, he calls an assembly of the birds to hear the proposed measure. Having obeyed the call, they for a time repudiate the authority of their master the Epopos, and prepare to destroy the intruders. Matters have come to a crisis, when the Epopos succeeds in restraining the infuriated Choros of birds and induces them to hear the men, "because one may learn prudence even from enemies" (v. 375). Actual hostility has exhausted itself in the *ἀκροβολισμός*; the Agon is quite peaceable. But there are antagonists, at least in form: the men, and the birds of the Choros. This antagonism is purposely indicated by the scene just enacted. But there can be only one antagonist on a side. Peithetairos accordingly represents the men. Who now is to represent the birds? Not the Koryphaios, for he, as a member of the Choros, has to sit in judgment on the contest; for the Choros *as such* has this function to discharge, no matter what is its relation otherwise to the action of the play. Moreover, the Koryphaios, in his capacity as leader of the first Hemichorion, must give the command to begin—the *keleusma*. Only the Epopos remains. Though himself convinced, he becomes an advocate, as it were, of the other birds. In speaking of them he says "we" or "they" as happens to suit. Hence those verses in the *epitheses* that are sometimes ascribed to the Choros belong to the Epopos. Other grounds of a technical nature are adduced by Zieliński for excluding the Choros from the *prosbalai*; but here they would be premature, and as they are themselves to be established by induction, we must avoid getting into a circle. But what becomes of Euelpides? He stands by and plays clown or jester. It will be found that this character—whom Zieliński calls the *βωμολόχος*—often takes part in the *prosbalai* (i. e. the *prosbole* and *antiprosbole*).

After due preparation the Choros sings the *ode* (451-459) and gives the *keleusma* (*ἀλλ' ἐφ' ὅτῳπερ κτέ.* v. 460) to Peithetairos, who begins the *epithesis* (*καὶ μὴν ὄργῳ κτέ.* v. 462). The obstacle to be overcome is the incredulity of the birds. If this is accomplished the more violent hostilities are averted. This result is brilliantly achieved. It is demonstrated beyond the possibility of cavil or doubt that the birds are the primeval and everlasting gods, and they are utterly without excuse if they do not regain the supreme power that has been lost through the degeneracy of recent times. In the *epistasis* (523 ff.) their present fallen estate is portrayed in

vivid colors. In the *antode* (539 ff.) the birds give expression to extreme mortification and grief and place themselves entirely at the disposal of Peithetairos. The *antikeleusma* (ἀλλ' ὅτι χρῆ κτέ. v. 548) bids him tell what is to be done. If there were a real contest on hand the *antepithesis* would have belonged to the other antagonist; but as it is, Peithetairos resumes and sets forth the plan with all its details (550 ff.). He is now fulfilling the original object of the assembly. In the *antepistasis* (611 ff.) he sums up the advantages that mortals will derive from the restoration of divine powers to the birds, especially as to the matter of temples and sacrifices. The *krisis* (627 ff.), pronounced by or for the full Chorus, contains four anapaestic tetrameters, as in the *Wasps*; but they are separated by a chorikon which ought to introduce the scene that follows. Zieliński proposes to transpose the last pair, so that all four tetrameters will precede the chorikon.

### 3. LYSISTRATE. *Agon*, 476-613.

The women, led by Lysistrate, have seized the Acropolis. The main body of these form the Chorus of women, but Lysistrate does not act as Koryphaios or leader of Hemichorion, for she is not one of the Choreutai. The men organize and, as Chorus of old men, approach with hostile intent, but are worsted in the encounter that ensues. One of the probouloι appears on the scene and calls the police to his assistance; but the women again prove too strong. By an exchange of words between the two Choroi in some pro-odic tetrameters the way is prepared for the Agon, the antagonists being the Proboulos and Lysistrate.

The Chorus of men sing the *ode* and give the *keleusma* (ἀλλ' ἀνερώρα κτέ. v. 484) to the Proboulos, directing him not to yield, but to bring to bear every *πλεγχος*. In the *epithesis* (καὶ μὴν αὐτῶν κτέ. v. 486) he inquires into the object that induced the women to seize the Acropolis. Although he has the floor, of course Lysistrate does nearly all of the talking, whilst one of the women plays *βωμολόχος*. At the end of the *epithesis* Lysistrate commands her antagonist to keep silent, and he indignantly asks if he is to keep silent for any one with a hood on; whereupon she says if that is the obstacle she can help him, and proceeds to do so in the *epistasis* by veiling his head and furnishing other aids to silence. The Chorus of women then sing the *antode*, and in the *antikeleusma* (ἀλλ' ἀ τηθῶν κτέ. v. 549) summons Lysistrate to begin the *antepithesis*. She proceeds to tell how they are going to benefit the state. The Proboulos raises occasional objections

only to have them promptly dissipated. In the *antepistasis*, as his objections begin to multiply, she cuts matters short by urging him to die and offering to aid in the preparations for his burial. The *antepistasis* contains two systems, but this is evidently due to a corruption.<sup>1</sup>

Of course, an actual decision of the contest is out of the question. An agreement between the two Choroi is impossible. Hence there is no *krisis*, but the *apallage* is represented by a *dialysis*, the first we have met. It has the normal form, the Proboulos uttering the first triad, 608-610, and Lysistrate the second, 611-613. Though it is no real truce it has the effect of a suspension of hostilities to bury the dead, the one who utters the first triad being the party requesting the suspension. There is a striking parallelism between the two tristichs.

II. The *prosbole* is anapaestic and the *antiprosbole* iambic.

4. The KNIGHTS. *Agon*, 756-940.

In this play contentions abound. There are two formal Agons, the present one being the more serious and important, though it comes after the other one. The main Agon, like all parts of the play, presents some peculiarities which are of special interest, as this is one of the earliest plays of the poet. It would be rash to say whether these peculiarities result from the poet's inexperience, or the more methodical treatment in the later plays is the result of progress in the art, due to Aristophanes along with others. Possibly both influences enter as factors, and it may be that neither does. The peculiarities of the Agons, at any rate, seem to result from the fact that the Chorus virtually plays the part of an ἀγωνιστής almost throughout the play, and the entire play is intended to be one continuous conflict. The Agons seem to be introduced merely because formal contests were customary, and with so much controversy it was not practicable to come through with only one;

<sup>1</sup> Γυνὴ β' makes a fourth actor present on the stage, introduced only here and that for the purpose of doing something that has just been done by another; for 604, καὶ τοντούγι λαβὲ τὸν στέφανον, repeats 602, λαβὲ ταντὶ καὶ στέφανος. Zieliński's opinion is that τὸν στέφανον, added as a gloss to τοντούγι, led to the corruption, the original reading having been λαβὲ τοντούγι καὶ στέφανος. Thus γυνὴ β' vanishes with her superfluous kolon, and the *antepistasis* becomes perfectly symmetrical with the *epistasis*; though this latter is not necessary. A different explanation had occurred to me, but I believe now that this is more probable. At any rate, whatever be its cause, no one can at all doubt the existence of the corruption, or reasonably doubt that it caused the anomaly.

though it is not to be understood that two Agons in one play are anomalous, any more than two Parabases.

The sausage-dealer Agorakritos has just had a wrangle with Kleon, who, as a true demagogue, proposes that they appeal to the dear People, to Demos himself, and manages to have the contest take place in the Pnyx. The *parakeleusis*, as usual, contains two parts, the *ode* and the *keleusma*; but the former comes near being no ode at all in the technical sense of an  $\phi\delta\eta\chi\omega\kappa\eta$ ; but it was regularly sung, and the scholiasts properly treat it as a regular choric ode. Both it and the *keleusma* ( $\delta\lambda\lambda\phi\vartheta\lambda\tau\tau\eta\kappa\tau\eta$ . v. 761) are addressed to Agorakritos. But, nevertheless, Kleon begins the *epithesis* ( $\tau\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$ , not  $\kappa\mu\mu\nu$ ). He opens with prayer. Agorakritos follows with a parody on his supplication. Kleon now proceeds to enumerate in a vague manner his services to Demos, whilst Agorakritos pleases the latter with little attentions, and shows that Kleon's seeming services to the state were due to selfish motives, and that some of his acts, such as the obstruction of peace, were positively hurtful. Demos speaks twice, once in praise of Agorakritos for a favor received, and once in condemnation of Kleon. It is difficult to distinguish which antagonist is the assailant. The one was summoned, but the other led off, and the whole *epithesis* is rather a *συμπλοκή*. Accordingly the *epistasis* (824 ff.), which properly belongs to the attacking party, is usurped by Agorakritos, and is rather a *σύστασις*, in which the sausage-dealer lays the blows violently upon Kleon, who makes one feeble effort. In the *antode* (836 ff.) Agorakritos is again addressed, and the *antikeleusma* encourages and exhorts him to a continuation of the conflict. But Kleon again seizes the initiative, and the *antepithesis* (843 ff.) is very much like the *epithesis*. Kleon goes slightly more into particulars, and Agorakritos makes freer use of little attentions to win the favor of Demos—such as presenting him a pair of slippers, a shirt, and the like. The judge is not at all insensible to favors, and repeatedly commends their bestower, whilst he disparages the demagogue. All of his utterances, however, are in the capacity of clown rather than of judge. The *antepistasis* (911 ff.) is divided between the antagonists (for surely 919 ff. are erroneously assigned to the Choros), Agorakritos uttering the closing sentence, in which he imprecates a curse upon Kleon; and the Choros, in lieu of a *krisis*, adds its amen in the name of three gods, using prose for the purpose. There is no *dialysis*, for the simple reason that the conflict continues without interruption.

5. The CLOUDS. *Agon*, 950-1104.

After a disorderly *ἀκροβολισμός*, in the form of a very long anapaestic hypermetron,<sup>1</sup> begun by the *δίκαιος λόγος* and ended by the *ἄδικος*, the Chorus in the *ode* announces the impending conflict, the ever-famous *ἀγῶν μέγιστος* (956). In the *keleusma* (ἀλλ' ἀ πολλοῖς κτέ. v. 959) the Dikaios Logos is exhorted to begin, which he does in the *epithesis* (λέξω τοῖνν, not καὶ μῆν), setting forth the excellence of the good old system of training the young, whilst the Adikos Logos makes occasional adverse comments. In the *epistasis* (1009 ff.) Dikaios sums up the advantages that will result from doing as he bids, and the evils that will follow the opposite course. In the *antode*<sup>2</sup> (1024 ff.) the Chorus commends him and his cause. In the closing lines of the *antode* and in the *antikeleusma* (1034 f.) the Adikos Logos is warned of the magnitude of his undertaking. He says in the *antepithesis* that he has been impatient for some time to confute his antagonist, and boasts of his ability to make wrong prevail over right. Here we have an explanation from the poet why the unjust cause is going to be successful. That such was to be the issue of the Agon the spectators would have known before this point was reached, if the play had been performed. How they would have known this will appear in the proper place. The Adikos Logos now, by a perfect masterpiece of the sophistic art, drives the Dikaios Logos so completely to the wall that he agrees in the *antepistasis* (1085 ff.) to appeal to a numerical test. The count is made, and the *εὐρύτρωκτοι* among the spectators are found to be vastly in the majority; whereupon the Dikaios Logos declares himself vanquished and joins the enemy. There is no *apallage*. A *krisis* could not have been more than a mere form, and a *dialysis* was out of the question. Hence the absence of this part of the Agon need not be ascribed to the incompleteness of the revision; but what we do miss is something like an acceptance of the situation on the part of Pheidippides, who, apart from the Chorus, was the sole witness of the contest, and was to decide for himself which *λόγος* he would choose. Moreover, the play as it stands would require five actors at this point.

<sup>1</sup> Not the longest we have, however, if Mnesilochos, frag. 4 (Kock), is worth counting.

<sup>2</sup> Whether the metrical discrepancy between this and the *ode* results from corruption or from the incompleteness of the revision, is a question that does not concern us here. No one doubts that the poet either made them correspond or intended to. The former alternative is by all odds the more probable.

III. The *prosbole* is iambic and the *antiprosbole* anapaestic.

6. The FROGS. *Agon*, 895-1098.

Dionysos has gone to Hades to bring back the soul of Euripides, whom he finds, at the head of a mob of criminals, attempting by violence to wrest the tragic throne of the lower world from Aischylos. No better basis for an Agon could have been devised. The god of the theatre himself is to act as judge. He succeeds in quieting the disturbance, and exhorts the antagonists to an orderly and decent contest. He bids Aischylos *Ἄλεγχ' ἐλέγχου* not in wrath but soberly, whilst Euripides declares himself ready *δάκνειν δάκνεσθαι*. So impressed is the god with the solemnity of the occasion that he institutes prayers for divine aid that he may be able to judge properly—*ἀγῶνα κρίναι τόνδε μονοτικώτατα* (873)—and requires the antagonists also to pray in their own behalf. The reason assigned for the prayer is *νῦν γὰρ ἀγῶν σοφίας ὁ μέγας χωρεῖ πρὸς ἔργον ηδη* (883 f.). After the prayers the Agon begins.

In the *ode* the Chorus of *Mystai* expresses interest in the terrible conflict and predicts its awful character. The *keleusma* (*ἀλλ' ὡς τάχιστα κτέ.* v. 905) is addressed to both antagonists, but the metre prescribed—the iambic tetrameter—vibrates a harmonious chord in the breast of Euripides, who accordingly begins the *epithesis* (*καὶ μῆν*). He devotes the first portion to the *Ἄλεγχος* of the Aeschylean drama, and the latter portion to the merits of his own works. Dionysos, though he is *κριτής*, acts also as *βωμολόχος*, in which capacity he discloses consummate ability. Aischylos makes no direct replies to the *Ἄλεγχος*, but devotes his energies to the repression of his wrath. But when Euripides begins to enumerate the “improvements” that *he* has made in tragedy, Aischylos fully agrees with him—*φημὶ κἀγώ*—and regrets only that he did not perish before he made them. In the *epistasis* (971 ff.) the assailant portrays the benefits accruing to society from his poesy (a characteristic feature of *epistases*), and Dionysos finishes the picture with some most grotesque touches. In the *antode* the Chorus exhorts Aischylos to be calm, as the occasion demands his best effort; and in the *antikeleusma* (*ἀλλ' ὡς πρῶτος κτέ.*) bids him turn loose his torrent. In the *antepithesis* he turns it loose. For a time even Euripides is swept before it. Dionysos resumes his rôle of clown, but at one point (1024 f.), if the text is correct, grows rather serious for a clown, and for a judge takes a rather active part in the contest. In the *antepithesis* (1006 f.) Aischylos reverses the order adopted by his antagonist, and first presents his own

merits, then the faults of Euripides, who begins to reply to the latter portion. The *antepistasis*<sup>1</sup> sums up the faults and describes the evil fruits of the Euripidean poesy, and Dionysos adds another *βωμολόχευμα*. Here we should expect the *krisis*; but a new scene begins, in which the Chorus declares the conflict indecisive and proclaims a continuation of the struggle. The contest continues through to the *Exodos*, as in the *Knights*, although the technical form has been exhausted. The final *κρίσις* of Dionysos is made after the actual contest is ended (1467 ff.).

#### IV. Both *prosbole* and *antiprosbole* are iambic.

The two Agons belonging to this class are secondary, each one occurring in a play that contains another more important Agon.

##### 7. The KNIGHTS. *Agon*, 303-460.

After a violent scene in the *Parodos*, Agorakritos and Kleon become involved in a logomachy which the Chorus turns into a formal Agon. In the *ode* (303 ff.) the Chorus heaps hearty abuse upon the head of Kleon, the latter and Agorakritos interrupting the *ode* with mesodic trochaic tetrameters. Then is uttered a rather ambiguous *keleusma* (ἀλλ' ἀ τραφεῖς κτέ. v. 333); the one clear thing about it is that it is addressed to a villain. Agorakritos begins the *epithesis* (καὶ μήν); but Kleon evidently thinks that *he* was meant, and a strange strife ensues (which will be explained in its place), Agorakritos maintaining, as he had done before, and no doubt with truth, that *he* too is a villain. Both antagonists, in consequence, have the floor simultaneously. As in the chief Agon of this play, the *epithesis* (335 ff.) is converted into a *συμπλοκή* and the *epistasis* into a *σύστασις*. The entire *prosbole* is billingsgate of the first quality. In the *antode* (382 ff.) both antagonists receive due attention. Some of the mesodic tetrameters of the *ode* have no antapodosis. This want of symmetry, as also the question of the proper assignment of 319-321, need not detain us here. The *antikeleusma* (407 f.) is the only one that does not directly or indirectly contain a summons to begin. Throughout the *antiparakeleusis*, in fact, the Chorus itself seems not to know who was the assailant in the *prosbole*, and accordingly, by giving the mere form of an *antikeleusma* without the substance, leaves both antagonists free to attack. Kleon then begins the *antepithesis* (409 ff.); but

<sup>1</sup> The catalectic dimeter 1088 breaks the hypermetron. Zieliński proposes ἔτι < τῶν > νννι. I had thought of ἔστιν νννι. There can be no reasonable doubt that the verse is corrupt.

immediately it becomes a melee ; and the latter part of the *antepi-stasis* (441 ff.) is taken from the antagonists altogether. Then follows the normal *krisis* of four iambic tetrameters ; but it is a *krisis* only in form. The substance of a *dialysis* is contained in the first few lines of the scene that follows.

#### 8. The CLOUDS. *Agon*, 1345-1451.

The *ἀδικος λόγος* has triumphed in the great Agon. Pheidippides has completed his course of instruction with marked success, and Strepsiades leads him into the house to celebrate the occasion with a feast. Presently he rushes out, pursued and beaten by his son. The lad not only admits that he has beaten his father, but offers to demonstrate that he did it justly. Strepsiades, utterly astounded and desirous to hear what in the world the young sophist can say in favor of such a doctrine, undertakes to argue the case with him ; and the Agon begins.

In the *ode* the Chorus warns Strepsiades of the critical nature of the contest, and in the *keleusma* (*ἀλλ' εἰς ὅρον κτέ.* v. 1351) bids him tell how the trouble began. This he does in the *epithesis* (*καὶ μήν*, v. 1353), saying that he had asked his son to sing at the feast and play the cithara, and the youth had expressed contempt (which he now repeats) for such grasshopper usages. He had then requested him at any rate to recite a piece from Simonides ; but the lad pronounced Simonides a bad poet, and even when Aischylos was timidly suggested he spoke contemptuously of him. Being then given free choice he recited a shocking *πῆναις* from Euripides—the story of Kanache. The old man's wrath boiled over ; word led to word and finally to blows from the young man. Here the narrative ends, and Strepsiades fears to renew the quarrel which threatens to break out afresh, and in the *epistasis* (1386 ff.) contrasts the kindness he had shown Pheidippides when a child with the treatment just received in return. The Chorus in the *antode* (1391 ff.) expresses gloomy forebodings as to the value of old men's skins if the new doctrine becomes established. The *antikeleusma* (1397 ff.) in appropriate words bids Pheidippides begin. He opens the *antepithesis* and in fine sophistic style proceeds to demonstrate his proposition. The father's replies are no trifles. We almost feel that the *Adikos Logos* and the *Dikaios Logos* are before us again ; but, as before, sophistry prevails and Strepsiades confesses himself vanquished. The son then offers him a consolation : he will beat his mother too ; and in the *epistasis* (1446 ff.) he proposes to prove that it would be right. The old man, almost stupefied

with amazement, can only suggest that the youth throw himself,  $\gamma\tau\tauων λόγος$ , Socrates and all, into the Barathron. There immediately follows an ordinary dialogue in iambic trimeters. Whether the poet, in completing the revision, would have added an *apallage* is not evident from the context. The transition seems to be natural and easy, and a *krisis* would be superfluous.

V. The Agon has a single *epicheiresis* instead of a *syzygy*. The *probole* is anapaestic in the two extant examples. Thesmoph. 531-573 is indeed iambic, but can hardly be counted as an Agon. Still it is probable that Agons of this class were sometimes iambic.

9. EKKLESIAZOUSAI. *Agon*, 571-709.

The great woman's rights *coup d'état* has been carried through. Blepyros, whose wife Praxagora has been missing since long before day, has learned from a passing friend the details of the proceedings at the Pnyx, but does not suspect that the women were there. The Choros of women appear before his house, where he confronts his wife in their presence. Having satisfied himself as to the cause of her absence in his clothes, he tells her the wonderful news. At first she has difficulty in realizing it, but at last says it will redound to the glory of the state. Blepyros is not so sure of that, but she says she can convince him; and the Agon begins.

In the *ode* the Choros exhorts her to have her wits about her and devise something new and astounding. The *keleusma* (ἀλλ' οὐ μέλλειν κτέ. v. 581) bids her begin promptly. In the *epithesis* (καὶ μήν, v. 583) she explains the policy that is to be pursued, which she does so knowingly that one might suspect that the matter was not wholly new to her. There is to be no private property, no lawsuits, no trouble of any kind, but feasting, happiness, and love—all as free as air. The slaves will do the work. Blepyros raises numerous objections, but they are met and all his doubting questions fully answered. In the *epistasis* she portrays the great advantages of the new constitution in regard to the sexual relations, and adds a clause to secure equal rights to the less favored. There is no *formal krisis* or *dialysis*. The resemblance to the Agon of the Birds will be apparent to all, but it is as that of Antigone to Elektra.

10. PLOUTOS. *Agon*, 487-626.

Chremylos and Blepsidemos are making arrangements to have sight restored to the blind god of riches whom they have in their

possession. The wan goddess Penia appears, and after denouncing their intended outrage, proposes to show that it would result in calamity to the human race, and that she alone is the cause of all blessings. They do not object to hearing her, and the Agon opens.

There is no *ode*; in fact there was no real Choros, as is evident from the manner in which the scant seeming chorika of the rest of the play are treated. In the *keleusma* (ἀλλ' ἥδη κτέ. v. 487) the Koryphaios, or whatever he should be called, gives the two men a summons to begin. Chremylos, then, in the *epithesis* sets forth at length the benefits that would flow from the restoration of sight to Ploutos: he would come only to the good and worthy, whereas now many good people starve, while many unjust prosper. Penia, in her replies, makes the false assumption that riches, according to the plan, are to be distributed to all alike. This error escapes Chremylos entirely.<sup>1</sup> After a long debate, in which Penia by no means gets the worst of it, Chremylos, more candid than most disputants, declares in the *epistasis* οὐ γὰρ πείσεις οὐδὲ ἡν πείσεις (600), and the two men get rid of their troublesome antagonist by simply driving her by main force from the stage. Naturally enough there is no *krisis*; but the Agon is very appropriately and, to the spectators, no doubt amusingly terminated with a *dialysis* both triads of which are uttered by Chremylos, his friend separating the two utterances for him by means of a distich.

II. Of the three plays that are virtually without an Agon, the *THESMOPHORIAZOUSAI* contains a passage which in form is a mutilated *Agon*, 531-573. The *ode* preceding 531 belongs to the foregoing syzygy, so that the Agon begins with the *keleusma* (ἀλλ' οὐ γάρ ἔστι κτέ.), which has only the form of a summons. In

<sup>1</sup> There is no visible reason for the introduction of this inconsistency. Aristophanes must have been conscious of it, just as in the *Clouds* he knew the cock was not a quadruped. But there the error was for comic effect, while this instance affords no amusement. Some think it grew out of the revision. It is perhaps idle to discuss the question; but some who have written on it commit an error analogous to that of Penia. They say that only the good, and so only those willing to labor, were to become rich; and hence there is nothing in Penia's objection that no one will want to work because he will have money without working. But did Chremylos' notion of the *χρηστοί* require them to labor? Did he mean to labor himself? Far from it. When he says the slaves will do the work he uses *μοχθεῖν*, a very significant word. His idea of the blessings of wealth is that it will enable a man to live without *μόχθοι*. Still the inconsistency remains.

the *epithesis* Mnesilochos and a woman become involved in a violent *λοιδορία* which is stopped by the Choros. This passage is entirely inadequate to fulfill the requisites of an Agon if each play is entitled to one. We may ignore its existence.

The results of the study of the *Fragmenta Comicorum*, which could not be very fruitful, may be summed up in the statement that there is all the evidence that could be demanded that other writers of the old comedy made use of the Agon, and that Aristophanes used them in his lost plays.

The survey that has been given shows the Agon to have been so fixed in form and substance and so essential to the very nature of comedy, and also to have been so familiar to the Athenian public, that we may well be surprised to find that there are three plays of Aristophanes in which it does not occur. It would be in order, therefore, to look into the causes of this peculiarity of those plays; but this must be reserved for another article. Let it suffice for the present to give assurance that, while it can hardly be demonstrated for all three, still it is certain in the case of one, and highly probable in the case of the other two, that they originally contained each an Agon. And even if the proofs fail to convince some, so much is irrefragable: it would be erroneous to assume that we know of any play of the old comedy that was *certainly composed without an Agon*.

We are now prepared to take a comprehensive view of the whole field. It will be observed that in all the plays of the serious class two opposing principles rise side by side, and begin to clash more and more until it is not possible for the action to proceed further without disposing of one of them, unless indeed the whole play is to be continual strife. In the more farcical plays a principle or tendency that is sure to challenge opposition arises, and grows to the point where it must either be suppressed or allowed to have full sway, the point where it must either *πείθειν* or *πείθεσθαι*. When this place has been reached in a comedy, all action of any other sort must be suspended while the two opposing principles in the serious class settle the question of supremacy by a formal contest, and in the other class the one growing tendency or principle disarms opposition. That the action should in all cases cease during the Agon (a fact emphasized by Zieliński) seems to me to be merely a necessity growing out of the debate. A suspension of the action, in other words, is not a characteristic of the Agon; the Agon is a suspension of the action; or rather, in one sense it

is itself a part of the action. Its length, indeed, as Zieliński justly remarks, and the impossibility of other action until it is ended, are calculated to create in us admiration for the patience of an Attic audience, especially when we consider that, as a rule, soon after the Agon comes the equally long Parabasis, which has nothing to do with the action of the play. But in fact it was just these that the public went to the theatre to witness. Whether the later comedy, when Agon and Parabasis had disappeared, was not more entertaining than the old comedy, is a question that does not concern us. The old comedy had grown into what it was, and had to grow, or shrivel, into something else. No one could suddenly revolutionize it. The indications are that originally, when there were no *άγωνισται*, the essential part of a comedy was a contest between the leaders of the Hemichoria, or, one might say, the two Choroi. This contest would be preceded by an introductory scene, which in the more fully developed comedy became the Parodos, including the Proagon (which is often a part of the Parodos). After the contest was over, the play proper being ended, the Choros unmasked and addressed the people. This usage of unmasking continued after the Parabasis ceased to form or to follow the close of the play. The Agon, then, as Zieliński remarks, corresponds to the *καταστροφή* of a tragedy, the *krisis* marking sharply the turning point—in the original comedy the virtual end—of the play. All that follows it is in a new field; we breathe a new air and have a clearer conception of our surroundings. The battle has been lost and won, or the question has been definitely settled, provided always the play is not intended to be one continual strife. When this is the case the Agon, as will presently be seen, is affected accordingly.

The participants in an Agon are the Choros (Hemichoria, Koryphaios, and leader of second Hemichorion), the two antagonists, the judge, and the clown, the last two not being essential.

The relations of the Choros to the contest are not fixed. The Choros, for instance, may all be on one side and adhere to that side as in the Knights, or all on one side and be brought over to the other as in the Wasps, or equally divided and remain so as in Lysistrate, not to mention other situations. Particularly striking is the fact that, while there is sometimes a duly appointed judge, the Choros directs the contest and proclaims the result, even though the Choreutai were as far as possible from impartial when the contest began. What chance has Kleon of receiving justice in the

Knights? Just as much, *a priori*, as Bdelykleon had of being successful in the *Wasps*; and yet he succeeded brilliantly. The Chorus was evidently on a higher plane than an American jury is supposed to be: it was thought possible for Choreutai to change their minds when they learned new facts and heard new arguments. Another interesting fact is reserved till we come to treat the form of the *Agon*.

The part taken by the Chorus in the *Agon* was probably limited to the *odai* and *keleusmata*.<sup>1</sup> The *ode* was sung by the first Hemichorion, the *antode* by the second. The *Koryphaios*, as leader of the first Hemichorion, pronounced the *keleusma*, and the leader of the second gave the *antikeleusma*. The *krisis* was pronounced by or in the name of the whole Chorus. It was also the duty of the Chorus, that is the Hemichoria, alternatingly, to execute a dance while the *epithesis* and *antepithesis* were being recited. Cf. Lys. 541; Schol. Ran. 896, ή πρὸς τὰς ρήσεις ὑπόρχησις.

The antagonists are naturally the most important participants. In plays of the trivial class they are hardly opponents at all; but still the negative disputant is either incredulous himself or else represents an incredulous body. The *Agon* then is only in form a contest. The poet makes use of it to instruct the spectators as to the nature of the new world into which they are introduced. The *Birds* would have been almost incomprehensible but for the instruction given by Peithetairos in the *Agon*. In plays of this kind, therefore, one disputant has the floor both in the *epithesis* and *antepithesis*; but the other asks questions and makes objections as much as he chooses. But in the serious moral or political plays the antagonism is earnest and often bitter. Sometimes the assailant has the *prosbole* almost entirely to himself, the other antagonist having the *antiprosbole*, as in the *Wasps*; but more commonly both parts are pretty evenly divided between the opponents. Yet even in this case one of them is distinctly the assailant

<sup>1</sup> Such is the view of Zieliński. Though it encounters some obstacles, the evidences in its favor are very strong. For these the reader is referred to Zieliński's work, especially pp. 117 f. and 293-312. It is to be regretted, however, that in the latter passage cited it is too strongly asserted that all iambic trimeters uttered by the Chorus, i. e. *Koryphaios*, are "vom strengen, tragischen Bau." I am not sure what "Bau" covers here, but the expression seems too sweeping when applied to verses in which not the slightest regard is had to the well known Porsonic law bearing on caesura in the fifth foot. Otherwise, however, his observation is correct, and the conclusion he draws is not affected by this oversight.

and the other the defendant in the *probole*, while in the *antiprobole* their attitudes are reversed. Now, when an army makes an attack (*ἐπίθεσις*) upon another and, without carrying the position, comes to a halt (*ἐπιστροφή*), a counter attack results in the rout of the assailant. So in the Agon : the speaker that is aggressive or has the floor in the *epithesis* is doomed already if there is an *antepicheiresis* or "antisyntagma." If there is no *antepicheiresis* the assailant is successful ; the battle ends with the capture of the position of the defendant. In other words, the last argument is the telling one ; and the usage probably grew out of the desire of the poets to have the issue of a contest accord with the impression made on the spectators. Whatever be its origin, this feature of the Agon must have been perfectly familiar to all the Athenians, and consequently it placed the poet under some embarrassment. It might be desirable to conceal the dénouement as long as possible. If the poet took the liberty of reversing the usual practice he would create confusion in the minds of the public and consequent dissatisfaction. It is interesting to observe how Aristophanes overcame this difficulty, and in one case even turned it into a source of amusement. The strange dispute at the opening of the secondary Agon of the Knights has been alluded to. Agorakritos, it will be remembered, had claimed superiority to Kleon even in villany, when the latter set up claims in that line. Now, when the Agon is ready to begin, the Chorus sings an *ode*, addressing Kleon and introducing Agorakritos as *σοῦ μαρώτερος* ; then comes the remarkable *keleusma*, 333 f. :

ἀλλ' ὁ τραφεῖς ὅθεντέρ εἰσιν ἄνδρες οἵπερ εἰσί,  
νῦν δεῖξον ὡς οὐδὲν λέγει τὸ σωφρόνως τραφῆναι.<sup>1</sup>

Agorakritos tries to begin, but Kleon disputes the right :

ΑΔ. καὶ μὴν ἀκούσαθ' οἴος ἔστιν οὐτοσὶ πολίτης.

ΚΔ. οὐκ αὐτὸν μὲν ἔάστεις ;

ΑΔ. μὰ Δι', ἐπεὶ κάγα πονηρός είμι.

ΚΔ. οὐκ αὐτὸν μὲν ἔάστεις ;

ΑΔ. μὰ Δία.

ΚΔ. ναὶ μὰ Δία.

ΑΔ. μὰ τὸν Ποσειδῶνα,

ἀλλ' αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ πρότερος εἰπεῖν πρῶτα διαμαχοῦμαι.

<sup>1</sup> The way in which the subject is announced suggests the manner in which Herakles put the question to Triballos on the surrender of the sceptre (Av. 1628) : ὁ Τριβαλλός, οἰμέσειν δοκεῖ σοι ;

I shall not stop to discuss any difficulties, real or supposed, in the interpretation. It is clear enough that each is contending for the right to speak first, that is, *for the privilege of being beaten in the contest*, as it would amusingly appear to the spectators. The result of this broil, as we have already seen, was that no one, not even the Chorus, could tell which was the assailant, and hence the *συμπλοκή* also in the *antepithesis*. It was simply intended that this Agon should be indecisive. The *krisis* is merely a congratulation for bravery on the field ; the battle is not yet won, or at least the war is not ended. The quasi *dialysis* shows Kleon to have been worsted, as he is first to speak. By a reference to the analysis of the chief Agon of this play the reader will see that it was analogous in many respects to the one just examined, and for the same reasons.

It has often been remarked by editors that in the contest between the *λόγοι* the metre in which each *λόγος* speaks seemed fitted to his character, the *δίκαιος* λ. leading off in vigorous anapaestic tetrameters, the *ἄδικος* λ. following up with ribald iambic tetrameters. In the Frogs, where the Agon is not to end in the triumph of wrong, Euripides, the doomed antagonist, opens with iambic tetrameters, while Aischylos follows with anapaests. A further examination of this subject, however, would be unfruitful.

The next participant in our list is the judge. When one is employed he is formally designated, and one might naturally expect more importance to be attached to his judicial function than is the case. In the Frogs, it will be remembered, the decision of Dionysos comes near the end of the play, the Chorus having pronounced the Agon indecisive. In the Clouds Pheidippides has not a word to utter in connection with the Agon. The *δίκαιος λόγος* confesses himself defeated. The incompleteness of the revision at this point must not be left out of view, nor must it have too much shouldered upon it. In the Knights Demos commends Agorakritos whenever the latter bestows a bribe upon him ; but that is almost the full extent of his part in the Agon. After the Chorus has pronounced the quasi *krisis* he concurs ; but this is in the opening of a new scene. His real decision, like that of Dionysos, comes later in the play, and settles the general contest that had pervaded the whole. Only the three plays enumerated have a judge at the Agon. In the two in which he speaks, the Frogs and the Knights, the part taken by the judge is rather in the capacity of clown.

The clown, or *βωμολόχος*, is not rarely introduced, though his presence is not essential. He is there, of course, for the purpose of rendering the debate amusing. Zieliński says his part was intended to keep before the minds of the spectators the fact that it was a comedy they were witnessing, and that his presence enabled the antagonists to be all the more serious. With this I do not fully agree. *Βωμολοχία* would have been a disturbing element in the *ἀγών μέγιστος* of the Clouds, just because of its serious nature. So in the Ploutos Agon, where the jester takes virtually no part, though the rest of the play is frivolous, the tone is recognized by Zieliński himself as being so serious that, when Chremylos undertook to jest, Penia at once reproved him (557 f.):

σκώπτειν πειρᾶ καὶ κωμῳδεῖν τοῦ σπουδάζειν ἀμελήσας.

The jester, as in actual life, is self-appointed. The judge himself, as already seen, may assume this function, or it may be a third actor, as in the Birds.

We now come to the form of the Agon. The introduction to the formal contest may be contained in the Parodos, or there may be a distinct Proagon or *ἀκροβολισμός*, as before observed. In the latter case the interscene is ordinarily composed in iambic trimeters. The peculiar exception in the great Agon of the Clouds has already received attention.

Between the *ode* and the *antode* there is as strict metrical correspondence as between the corresponding parts of the Parabasis, or between strophe and antistrophe in tragedy. Exceptions are evidently due to corruption and are no more common than in other instances of metrical responson. The pro-odic and strange mesodic verses which sometimes appear are never composed in the metre of the *epithesis* or *antepithesis*, but in that of the Parodos. Zieliński thinks this may be due to accident, as the examples are so few. I think, however, that it may safely be stated as a rule. We should expect these tetrameters to harmonize with some neighboring part of the play, and it should always be the same part. This could not be the *epithesis*, for sometimes the *antepithesis* is in a different rhythm, so that the antimesodic verses would either have to clash with the *antepithesis* or with the mesodic verses.

The *keleusma* always consists of two anapaestic or iambic tetrameters, and authoritatively prescribes the metre of the *epithesis*. This fact was observed by the scholiasts. Cf. Schol. Av. 451 ff.:

ἐν εἰσθέσει [read ἐκθέσει] δὲ στίχοι ἀναπαιστικοὶ τετράμετροι δύο ὅμοιοι τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς ἔξης εἰσθέσεως ξά. Id. 539 ff.: ἔχει δὲ καὶ ἐν ἐκθέσει τοὺς συνήθεις δύο στίχοις ἀναπαιστικούς ὅμοιούς τοῖς ἔξης ξά. Schol. Nub. 1345 ff.: ἐν ἐκθέσει δὲ στίχοι δύο ἱαρβικοὶ τετράμετροι ὅμοιοι τοῖς ἔξης. ἔθος γάρ ἐστι προτιθέναι τῆς διπλῆς διστιχίαν μετὰ τὴν περίοδον τῆς κορωνίδος ή τῆς φθῆς. So Schol. Eq. 755 it is called τὸ ἔθιμον. Cf. also Schol. Eq. 322 ff., Nub. 1024 ff., Ran. 992 ff.<sup>1</sup>

The *keleusma* proper (not the *antikeleusma*) invariably begins with ἀλλά. Westphal (Met. II, p. 402, note 3) erroneously represents the elided form ἀλλ' as being universal in anapaestic *keleusmata* (Vesp. 649 is *antikeleusma*). In Eq. 761 we find ἀλλά φυλάττου. The usual elision was no doubt due to metrical considerations. In fact ἀλλά itself is the natural conjunction with which to make the transition from the *ode* to the *keleusma*, this transition being less abrupt at the end of the *antode*. Still its use may have become canonical from the very fact that it was *generally* necessary; and the same principle may apply to the elision.

The *keleusma* does not belong to the *ode*, for it is not sung by the *Choros*. This is shown by the fact that the *antikeleusma* may be in a different rhythm. There are technical reasons also for excluding it from the *epithesis*. As it is recited by the leader of the *Hemichorion* that sings the *ode*, and is in substance like the *ode*, I have, for convenience, called the two παρακέλευσις. If the system of nomenclature were devised with reference to the form instead of the substance, then what I have called the *prosbole* would include the *keleusma* alongside the other two parts (*epithesis* and *epistasis*).

The form of the *epithesis* has already been repeatedly mentioned. The question of symmetry as to the number of verses between the *epithesis* and *antepithesis* cannot be discussed here. Zieliński, in the latter part of his whole work, attempts to prove its existence,

<sup>1</sup> There are also general allusions to the *Agon*. The Schol. Ran. 900 (*ode* of *Agon*) says: προσδοκῶν οὐν: Ἐθος τοῖς ποιηταῖς προλέγειν ἀ εἰς τὸ ἔξης λέγειν μελλοντο. This is nonsense except as limited to the *ode* of the *Agon*. The remark is of special interest as a testimony with regard to other comedians than Aristophanes: for he says τοῖς ποιηταῖς. Zieliński finds a reference to the judge and the antagonists in Luc. de Calumn. 6: τοιάντη μὲν ἡ ὑπόθεσις τοῦ λόγου· τριῶν δ' ὄντων τῶν προσώπων, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς κωμῳδίαις, τοῦ διαβάλλοντος καὶ τοῦ διαβαλλομένου καὶ τοῦ πρὸς δὲ ή διαβολὴ γίγνεται, κτέ. If this refers specially to the *Agon* it would imply that the *κριτής* was more common than the extant plays would indicate.

or rather to establish an analogous eurhythmy in the two parts. This effort is the least satisfactory part of his work ; but it would be unjust to state its weak points without giving his whole investigation, which cannot now be done. He does not resort to emendation, as some have been inclined to do.

Each *epithesis* is composed in one continuous metre. The familiar exception, Nub. 1415, *κλάουσι παιδες, πατέρα δ' οὐ κλάειν δοκεῖς*, is justified by the parody. Still, of course, it has been abundantly emended. In Nub. 1085 ff. there are four iambic trimeters, seeming to form a link between the *antepithesis* and the *antepistasis*. Zieliński simply breaks them up into six dimeters, reading *ποτ' ἀν* for *ποτέ* (1086). The schol. had the trimeters in his text ; and I must confess that I should have preferred to find the change into dimeters accomplished without dividing words between kola, however common this may be elsewhere in iambic hypermetra. But in spite of all this it is difficult to believe that the poet inserted those trimeters between a tetrametric passage and its *ἐκθεσις*.

The *epithesis* may, without grammatical pause, pass into its *epistasis*. It is a case of *στήναι τρέχοντα*.

The *epistasis* is always a hypermetron in the same rhythm as the *epithesis*, to which it stands related as an *ἐκθεσις*. Consequently the paroemiac or catalectic kolon is allowed only at the end. The only two seeming exceptions, Lys. 602 and Ran. 1088, have been mentioned. In some instances the number of kola in the *epistasis* and *antepistasis* is the same, and in one or two cases a slight change will produce this equality ; but the evidence, as a whole, is decidedly against any law either of correspondence or of eurhythmy.

The *epistasis* marks the end of the *epithesis* or attack. The assailant pauses as if to secure his position. We often find here a recapitulation, or at least a summing up of the merits of the principle advocated by the speaker, and sometimes the demerits of the opposed principle. The tone is usually more frivolous, and *σκόρπια* on the part of the antagonists are quite in order.

The *krisis* normally consists of four verses in the metre of the *antepithesis*. The number four has a far-reaching significance in tetrametric composition, as Zieliński has shown in his discussion of the other parts of the comedy.

The *krisis* and the *dialysis* I have combined under the common head *apallage*. This name, it need scarcely be said, relates

exclusively to the substance, not the form. It has already been seen that the *apallage* is rarely complete, and is sometimes wanting altogether. The circumstances controlling this feature were noted above; but there is a fact, connected with the total absence of a *krisis*, which deserves special attention, and which it seemed best not to touch upon until all the phenomena had been collected and examined. It is this: when the issue of an Agon is adverse to the principle which the poet approves, that is, when the comedy is of the Antigone type rather than the Elektra, there is no *krisis* at the end, but the Chorus remains silent. The result is indicated clearly by the antagonists themselves, the vanquished either proclaiming his own defeat or else being driven from the stage. To determine whether this *is* a fact or not requires that we without prejudice decide which plays belong to the class mentioned. Fortunately this has been decided by a most competent judge, who is so far from being prejudiced that he says with regard to the chief Agon of the Clouds: "Wie stellt sich nun der Chor zu einem solchen Ausgange, der seinem Wunsche und der Forderung der Gerechtigkeit so wenig entspricht? Leider hat Aristophanes uns die Sphragis (= *krisis*), die wir mit Fug und Recht als Abschluss des Wortstreites erwarten dürfen, nicht hinzugedichtet." He ascribes the absence of a *krisis* at the end also of the secondary Agon of this play (which is of the same sort) to the incompleteness of the revision. In all this he seems to me to have gone slightly astray; but we can so much the more rely upon his opinion that in the Birds the poet is in sympathy with Peithetairos, and in Ploutos with Penia. The evidence in favor of my view can be felt in its full force only by those who will take the pains to recall or to examine all the Agons with special reference to this point. Even in Ekklesiazousai the Chorus of women, fresh from the Pnyx, where they had put the great measure through, are not allowed to utter a word at the end of the Agon. When Praxagora has finished her *epistasis* she says to Blepyros and his friend (710), *φέρε νῦν, φράσον μοι, ταῦτ' ἀρέσκει σφόν*; They answer, *πάντα*. I look upon this trimeter as a part of the Agon, representing the *apallage*, that is, the *krisis* and *dialysis* combined.

The *dialysis*, as has been already stated, consists of a pair of triads composed in iambic trimeters and spoken each by one of the antagonists. In its full form it is still rarer than the *krisis*. Its occurrence is not frequent enough to justify any generalizations as to the conditions of its presence or absence. One fact may be

observed : the victor speaks the second triad ; hence, when there has been no decision of the general contest by the Agon, as in Lysistrate, the speaker of the first triad, so far as the spectators are concerned, confesses himself as worsted in the conflict. The second triad seems to be modelled after the first, being a sort of modified echo of it.

The position of the Agon has been alluded to as being between the Parodos and the Parabasis. The exception in the case of the Clouds need not trouble us, as we do not know where the Agons or Parabasis would finally have been placed. The *ode* and *keleusma* of the original Agon are to be found before the new Parabasis. Cf. 457-477. The only real exceptions, then, are the Frogs and the Knights. In both these the contest runs entirely through the play, and in the case of the Knights one Agon does precede the Parabasis, thus : Parodos, secondary Agon, Parabasis, chief Agon, secondary Parabasis.

After the decline, or rather the abolition of the Choros, when the Parabasis disappeared, the syzygy of the Agon was reduced to a single *epicheiresis*. In the two extant Agons of this period the *prosbole* is anapaestic. It would not be safe to conclude from this that it was never iambic. The *Ωπαὶ* of Aristophanes belonged to this period, and a long fragment (D. 476) of it, composed in iambic tetrameters, seems to belong to an *epithesis*. This modification of the Agon and omission of the Parabasis were accompanied by a change in the Parodos. The original elements were giving place to the new scenes : the old comedy was passing away.

In closing this article I wish to apologize for having said many things that must have been perfectly familiar to some of my readers. The reason for saying them, I hope, will be obvious. It was for the purpose of weaving them into a whole which is, or was, certainly not familiar to some who have written on Aristophanean subjects. It will not be out of place to give a few illustrations of this fact. They will show that it is not unreasonable to hope for some practical fruits from a recognition and study of the Agon. Westphal (Metrik, II, p. 421, note) remarks that a striking difference between the play of the Clouds and all the other comedies is, that it contains two *Syntagmata* (= Agons), while none of the rest contain more than one ; whereas we have seen that the Knights contains two full Agons. In the Firmin-Didot text and in Green's school edition, not to mention others, the *keleusma* of the Frogs

(905 f.) is actually assigned to Dionysos—not, indeed, without the authority of nearly all the MSS. Even J. H. H. Schmidt, in his *Compositionslehre*, includes in the *ode* and *antode* the *keleusma* and *antikeleusma* in the secondary Agon of the Clouds and of the Knights. Teuffel, in his note on the chief Agon of the Clouds, remarks that possibly the final revision would have made the number of verses in the *epithesis* and *antepithesis* the same. No one will deny the possibility of this; but the remark shows that the author had not examined the corresponding phenomena of other plays. One of the most remarkable instances of disregard of the nature of an Agon is found in Arnoldt's *Chorpartien bei Aristophanes*. He attempts to establish "das Auftreten einzelner Choreuten," and distributes to the individual Choréutai their respective parts. In the Knights he begins with the Parodos and runs continuously on into the Agon in such a way that *the keleusma falls to the tenth Choreutes and the antikeleusma to the sixteenth*. This distribution is, indeed, only tentative, but it is at the same time utterly inconceivable to one who has any conception of the Agon. Examples might be greatly multiplied, but these are sufficient for the purpose.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

#### IV.—ON THE GREEK TREATMENT OF ORIGINAL HARD ASPIRATES.

The hard aspirate series, now generally admitted to be original, presents some difficulties which have not recently received any adequate notice. They are expressed by Brugmann in his new *Grundriss*, §553, when he asks why we have  $\eta\sigma\theta a$ ,  $o\sigma\theta a$ , but  $\tau\sigma\tau\eta\tau$ ,  $\pi\alpha\tau\sigma$ , answering to forms in Sanskrit with *th*. He cuts the knot by refusing originality to those aspirates which only show themselves in the Indo-Iranian, but he admits (p. 352) that the law which produced aspirates out of tenues in that group is “*freilich nicht ersichtlich*.” I venture to suggest a law which, by explaining the double treatment in Greek, leaves us free to accept the Sanskrit or Zend evidence as decisive for the I. E. I believe the differentiation of  $\hat{k}h$ ,  $qh$ ,  $th$ ,  $ph$  into  $\chi$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\phi$  or  $\kappa$ ,  $\tau$ ,  $\pi$  was caused by a stress accent in the earliest period of Greek. The changes developed in the character of the Greek accent as the language grew older of course introduced confusion into the working of this principle, but among the forms stereotyped in the earlier stage there are sufficiently striking examples left to justify a rule backed by sound phonetic analogies. The rule may be stated thus: *Original hard aspirates lose their aspiration in Greek except where the accent immediately precedes.* This will be seen to have a close relationship with Verner’s Law in Teutonic. In both cases an explosive with strong expiration has a tendency towards weakening, and this tendency is checked by the influence of a stress accent. Initial cases, which are the most frequent, had a double treatment, except when the accent lay on the first syllable. Two stressed syllables could not lie together, and so the accent *following* a hard aspirate, initial or medial, always caused de-aspiration. Accordingly, during the period while the law was an active force, root-accented words with an initial hard aspirate would in Greek begin with a *tenuis*, while forms otherwise accented would appear as sentence doublets, showing the *tenuis* after barytone words or a pause, the aspirate after oxytones. These principles will be seen best in some ideal urgr. examples of (a) *tenuis*, (b) *aspirate*, (c) *doublets*, produced by various accentuation in the verb of a dependent clause. I will

use the  $\checkmark$  *sghaid* for simplicity's sake, ignoring the alternative *sghait*.

- (a) *sghaɪdō* = σκαΐδω.
- sghesghaɪda* = ἐσκαΐδα.
- (b) *é sghaidom* = ἐσχαίδον.
- é sghidom* = ἐσχίδον.
- sghesghaɪltha* = ἐσκαΐσθα.
- (c) *né sghidiɛti* = ἀνήρ σχίζει.
- nér̥m sghidiɛti* = ἀνέρα σκιζεῖ.

Levelling apparently took place when the dialect period had set in. It was not completely carried out, since a number of doublets are preserved in which  $\sigma\kappa$ -,  $\sigma\pi$ - appear side by side with  $\sigma\chi$ -,  $\sigma\phi$ -.

In most cases the aspirate form eventually prevailed: the greater force of the initial expiration will fairly account for the survival of the stronger form. I will proceed to give some examples in proof of my proposed law.

-θa, Skt. and I. E. -tha, suffix of 2d sing. perf. Here the accent always preceded, and accordingly we have the aspirate in *Fōiσθa* and *ἡσθa*. Contrast with this the tenuis in *ἐστέ*, Skt. *sthá*, I. E. primary 2d plur. suffix -the. The -τe which prevails in Greek may be simply the secondary suffix, though in *ἐστέ* the probability seems to lie in favor of supposing a primary -the treated according to our law. But it is at least worth noticing that \*-θe would only stand regularly in the comparatively small class of verbs with accented thematic vowel (viz. those in -iō, -skhō, and aorist-presents).

-σκω verbal class suffix. Bartholemae (K. Z. 27, 366 sqq.) maintains that the Skt. *ch* represents an I. E. *kh*, not *sk*. Brugmann's ground for writing -skō is apparently nothing but the κ in Greek, which our law here at once explains: the weakened root and the Skt. accent phenomena prove the original type *g̃mskhō*.

-τος superlative and ordinal suffix, I. E. -thós, cf. Skt. *jyes̥hā-* (Meyer<sup>2</sup> 391); superl. -isthos regularly root-accented, but never on penult, requiring -θos. An original \*teraprós is proved by Skt. *caturthá-*, cf. Goth. *ahtuda-*: an alternative accent appears in Skt. *saptáthá-*, A. S. *seofofa*.

In the words *κόγχος*, *ὄνυξ* (apparently for \*ογχ-s, with anaptyctic *v*), *ἄχνη*, *μάχη*, *μόθος*, *πλίνθος*, *στόρθη*, Meyer (Gk. Gr.<sup>2</sup> §203) gives parallels proving an original hard aspirate. All these as they stand have accents preceding the aspirate in question: one or two

indeed may have had it only as an alternative sentence accent, belonging properly to forms with strong root.

In the following words there are fairly clear parallels in Skt. having hard aspirates. The Greek has the tenuis, but in each case there is evidence for an accent *following*.

*πλατίς*, Skt. *pr̥thū-*, a clear case surely (despite Lith. *platūs*), though ignored by Meyer, who compares *πλάθανος* nevertheless. The latter has a *θ* answering to the accent it bears; this (like that in the Skt. *v̥śan-*, Gk. *δάρσην*) may point to an alternative with stronger root.

*δοτίον*, Skt. *asthán-*; *δύστανος*, Skt. *sthāna-*; *μερὰ*, Skt. *mithás*, A. S. *med*; *στέγω*, *στέγος*, Skt. *sthāgati*; *κῆδος*, *κῆδω*, Skt. *khādati*; *κόλος*, Skt. *kharvā-*; *στήλη*, Aeol. *στάλλα*, Skt. *sthāñā* = \**sthūlnā*; *σκόροδον*, Skt. *chard*.

I think these examples are strong enough to prove my rule. I proceed to give some new ones and discuss apparent exceptions.

*ἀφελέω* is, I believe, a compound of the old preposition *ἀ* and the word found in the Skt. *phala-*, fruit; it would thus answer to an I. E. *ጀ phelesiō*, bring advantage to. The preposition bearing the accent makes the *φ* regular. The form presupposes a neuter noun *phelos*, which appears in *ἀφελος* compounded with the same preposition. *Ὀφελλω* shows a different conjugation. The *ω*- was shortened when it had gone out of separate use because it was supposed to be the temporal augment (cf. Osthoff's similar explanation of *ἐθέλω*). I think some further traces of this preposition may be added to those collected by Fierlinger in his article on *ἀκεανός* (K. Z. 27, 477). *Πρόστω* = *προτίω*, *ἄνω*, *κάτω*, etc., are compounds like *ὑπέκ*, *διάπρο*.<sup>1</sup> *Ὀδύσσομαι* shows *ω* clearly in *ῳδνσίη* (Hes.). It cannot phonetically be compared with Skt. *dviṣ*; the root seems rather to be *dyes*, to which I should refer the Latin *bestia*. The non-disappearance of *s* in the noun quoted is perhaps due to analogy, while the verb-forms actually found do not require it. In the verbs *ἀδύρομαι*, *ἀκέλλω*, *ἀμάργυνυμι*, compared with *δύρομαι*, *κέλλω*, *μόρξαντο*, we can trace compounds: how perfectly unreasonable is the supposed "prothesis"! We might add *ἀτρύνω* and others.

*τρέχω*, *τροχός*, I. E. *✓ thregh* (Brugmann, *Grundriss*, p. 408), are regular, by the Greek rule for consecutive aspirates, as well as by that now under discussion. The future *θρέξομαι*, whose accent is original, seems directly adverse; but it only occurs in composition,

<sup>1</sup> Havet, I see, has anticipated this.

and the preposition, which like the augment in the aor. *ἐθρέξα* would bear the accent, makes the *θ* regular.

*ἴστην*, Skt. *āsthām* (ib. p. 407), is a case of levelling. The accent would produce a tenuis in *\*ἰστῆμι*, *\*ἰσταμέν*, *οἴτησω*, etc., and all monosyllabic forms, so that isolated types like *\*ἴσθην* had a very small chance of survival.

*σκίδηνημι* should, I think, be separated from *σκεδάννυμι* because of the vocalism. Meyer's explanation seems to me less simple than putting *σκίδηνημι* and *σχίζω* with the Skt. *chid*, I. E. *✓ sghait* (*sghaid*). Both have weak roots, so there was no accent after the tenuis which would prevent the double treatment from surviving.

*σκεδάννυμι* then belongs to the root *sghed*, Skt. *skhad*; for the treatment of the velar cf. Brugmann, Gr. §425. The *χ* doublet is seen in *σχεδία* and *\*σχαζώ*. For the latter I assume a parallel root *sghend*, originally a nasal present-stem petrified in the I. E. The form *κεδαίωμα*, found in Apollonius, will explain the construction of the difficult *σκεδάννυμι*. It becomes a denominative from a lost neuter *\*σκέδας*, I. E. *sghēdəs*, i. e. (*σ*)*κεδαστόμα*, aor. *ἐ(σ)κέδασ(σ)α* like *ἐτέλεο(σ)α* from *τέλος*. The *κ* thus was preserved because of the accent on the root.

*ἐρείκω* seems against the rule. But Homer has only *ἥρικον*, I. E. *ē rīghom*, and the aor. *ἥριξα* and the Skt. *rīkhāti* bear witness to an older aorist-present with regular *κ*.

The following verbs have descended, some certainly, some possibly, from roots with hard aspirates. They exhibit double treatment, all being accented on the formative suffix of the present-stem. (a) *φράζω*, *σφάλλω*, *σχάζω* and *χάζοματ*, *σχάω*, *φθάνω*; (b) *κόπτω*, *σκάζω*, *σκάρω*, *πάλλω* (?), *σκύλλω*, *σπαργάω* (contra *σφαραγέοματ*, Skt. *sphūrj-*, I. E. *sphēg-*), *σπάίω* (?).

In most of the remaining examples there may, I think, be found additional evidence for an original sentence accent in nouns. It would seem that nouns had originally a double accent system, producing of course double forms of roots. The mass of results have naturally been obscured by levelling. When the sense emphasized the meaning of the word itself, the root received the accent; when its case relation became prominent, the stress was laid when possible on the case suffix. So in English we emphasize the noun itself in such sentences as "Homer praised the Greeks, not the Trojans"; while we lay stress on what answers to the case suffix when we say "Homer sang *of* the Greeks, *for* the Greeks, *among* the Greeks." The principle, if accepted, needs obviously the utmost caution in the application.

Thus *κεφαλή*, Skt. *kapāla* and A. S. *hafola* show three different accents. Verner's Law shows that the A. S. word was accented on the root syllable. If my rule is right, the Greek *φ* is a trace of the same condition. Skt. shows the formative suffix with hochstufe and accent to match; Greek the weak form belonging to the oblique cases and accent also suiting. The Skt., however, preserves an apparent trace of the weak form in its *p*, which could only have come from *ph* by contact with the *l*; cf. dialectic Greek *κεβλή*, which has not developed the anaptyctic vowel.

*ἀσκηθήσ*, Eng. *unclothed*. The Greek is an adj. from *\*σκῆθος*, which answers exactly to the Gothic *skathis*; A. S. *sceaþa* also shows accent on the root. The obsolete noun seems to have bequeathed its *θ* to the derivative.

*μυχός* must surely be the Skt. *mukha-*, mouth? In that case the Greek accent and the tiefstufe of the root represent the oxytone form, while the Skt. accent and the *χ* preserved in Greek witness an alternative paroxytone, probably with hochstufe.

*φέγγος*, quoted by Kluge, etc., seems dead against the proposed rule. But the Homeric declensions *πένθος*, *βένθος*, gen. *\*παθέος*, *\*βαθέος*, suggest that it may have been originally *\*πέγγος*, gen. *\*φαγέος* or *\*παγέος*. The survival of the *φ* doublet would be assisted by the obvious analogy of the synonym *φάος*.

*ἀθήρ*, *ἀθάρη* has long been compared with the Skt. *athar-*, Zend *atar-*. The *t* of the Zend form (instead of the regular *p*) has been shown by v. Fierlinger (K. Z. 27, 334) to come from the weak cases *ātrā*, etc. The same form gives us the rationale of the Greek *θ*. The strong root points to a root-accented alternative, and hence the aspirate of *ἀθήρ*.

*σφαιρά* originally could only have preserved the aspirate in the genitive and dative. The I. E. would be *sph̥r̥i̥z*, acc. *sph̥r̥(i)im(m)*, gen. *sph̥r̥i̥ás*. The two first forms would pass regularly to *\*σπαῖρα*, *\*σπαῖραν*, but the gen. would show alternatives *φ* and *π*, the former eventually surviving.

*σκίζα*, Skt. *khud* (Meyer) is an example of the reverse process, the *κ* surviving.

*στῦλος*, against Skt. *sthūlā*, is a clear example; Greek has the root-accented alternative, which suits the *r*.

*σκύλον*, *Σκύλλα*, cf. Skt. *khur* (unquotable), Lat. *scortum*, and *σκύλλω*, exhibit as they stand an accent necessitating the tenuis.

*σκιά* is the weak ablaut answering to Skt. *chāyā* and *σκούός*, i. e. *\*σκωτ-ίός*. Probably the Skt. has the accent of the weak form, and a strong *skhōt-iā* may have fixed the *κ* in Greek.

*παρθίνος* is a difficult word, but the Skt. *pr̥thukā* (Curt., Meyer) must have some connexion with it. Bezzemberger's root *bhrendh* would form *\*παρθίνος*. The Skt. word is differently constructed, but its accent suggests an alternative form with strong and accented root, the accent surviving in the θ. *Παρθίνος* looks like a participial form; its connexion with the root *preth*, increase, is rendered uncertain by the *l* appearing in the other derivatives (*πλατύς*, etc.).

*πόντος* is usually supposed to correspond to *πάτος*, Skt. *pánthās*, gen. *pathás*. This would be an aggravated violation of my rule, as there seems to be some evidence that a preceding nasal could preserve an aspirate even against the accent. The analogy of *\*πάτος = pñthós* would scarcely be strong enough to explain the irregularity. I think there are grounds for separating the words altogether. The differentia of *πόντος* is the "broad expanse of ocean." How can this have been attained through a word meaning "path," given at a time when "*dissociabilis Oceanus*" was far from being transformed into "*ὑγρὸς κέλευθος*"? We get the exact shade of meaning required by bringing in the root *pent*, spread, connected with *pet* (cf. Lat. *pateo*, *pando*) in the way suggested above in dealing with *σχάζω*. *Πάτος* may then be left with the Skt. words and the Gothic *finþan*, and the weak root shows the original oxytone which produced the *r*; a short sonant nasal would not affect this.

*Προμηθεύς* apparently represents a stem *promñthēy-*, with which we may still compare the Skt. *pramantha-*, fire-stick. I cannot see why Meyer continues to deny this; so remarkable a coincidence of meaning would tempt one to explain away even serious phonological difficulties, and of such it is hard to detect any here. The θ, despite accent, may be attributed to the long nasal preceding.

*δμφαλός* has an I. E. *ph* betrayed by A. S. *nafela*, which Verner's Law shows to have been accented on the root. This word and its parallel *ðvñg* present great difficulties in their morphology. We find them in all the I. E. dialects under two distinct radical types: *nōbh*, *noȝh* and *ombh*, *onȝh*, with the additional peculiarity that there is clear evidence for both *bh*, *ȝh* and *ph*, *ȝh*. Except, of course, the last feature, the same state of things is revealed in the families of *ðvñpa* and (on one theory) *ērvñia*. I believe the hard aspirate was developed out of the soft in the I. E. by the proximity of the nasal. The aspirate breath (if such it was) tended to assimilate its voiced companion whenever circumstances favored.

The nasal shut off the latter from the preceding vowel, which helped it to stand its ground by slightly detaching it from its breath and drawing it partially into its own syllable. The assistance of certain accentual conditions may then have completed the unvoicing process. In that case the three forms of the root would be as follows :

<i>Tiefstufe (tonlos).</i>	<i>Hochstufen.</i>	
	1.	2.
<i>omph</i>	<i>nobh</i>	( <i>nōbh</i> )
<i>onqh</i>	<i>no<sup>g</sup>h</i>	( <i>nōg<sup>h</sup></i> ; cf. - <i>ώνυχος</i> ?)
<i>onmn</i>	<i>nomn</i>	<i>nōmn</i>

I should explain the initial vowel of the *tiefstufe* as a *psychological* prothesis, put in to make the form recognizable, and consciously recalling the color of the *hochstufen*. In *δυσώνυμος* the *long* vowel is recalled.

I should like to give before closing two good Teutonic examples of hard aspirates, which might be added to Kluge's list (K. Z. 26, 88). They are in our words *hue* and *froth*. The former, Goth. *hiwi*, A. S. *héo*, is exactly equal to the Skt. *chávi-*, with same meaning. *Froth*, Icel. *fropá*, Dan. *fraade*, answers to the Skt. root *pruth*, Vedic *próthati*, cf. *prá pruth*, to blow out the cheeks. The Teut. noun would thus be I. E. *proúthos*.<sup>1</sup>

J. H. MOULTON.

KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND, May 13, 1887.

<sup>1</sup> I should like to express my very great obligation to Prof. Maurice Bloomfield, for his corrections and suggestions on the proof-sheets of this paper.

## V.—*ἴθιμος* UND VED. *Kṣi-*.

Böhtlingk und Roth unterscheiden im PW. drei verschiedene Wurzeln, die im Sanskrit sämmtlich in der Form *kṣi-* erscheinen, dabei jedoch in der Bildung des Präsensstammes auseinandergehen, nämlich 1. *kṣi-*, *kṣet-ti* "weilen, wohnen," 2. *kṣi-*, *kṣadya-ti* "besitzen, verfügen über, beherschen," 3. *kṣi-*, *kṣinā-ti* und *kṣīya-te* "vernichten," im Med. u. Pass. "abnehmen, umkommen." Grassmann hat in seinem Wörterbuche zum RV. die beiden ersten Wurzeln zu einer einzigen zusammengefasst, wie auch schon B.-R. zu 2. *kṣi-* bemerken: "ist wol ursprünglich identisch mit 1. *kṣi-*." Aber das Iranische zeigt, wie bereits Hübschmann in der Zeitschr. d. Dt. Morgenl. Ges. 38 (1884), S. 429, u. Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. II 168 bemerkt haben, dass es sich um zwei von Haus aus verschiedene Wurzeln handelt. Dem altind. *kṣi-*, *kṣet-ti* entspricht im Avesta *ši-*, *šaē-ti* "wohnen"; dazu *ši-ti- f.* "Wohnung" = ved. *kṣi-ti- f.* und *šōi-pra- n.* "Flur, Wohnsitz" = ved. *kṣē-tra- n.* Dem altind. *kṣi-*, *kṣāya-ti* dagegen steht im Avesta *hši-*, *hšayē-ti* "herschen, mächtig sein, vermögen" zur Seite; der Anlaut hat dieselbe Lautgestalt wie in *hšapra- n.* "Herrschaft, Reich" = ved. *kṣatrad- n.* Also wir haben es hier mit den beiden Arten des altind. *kṣ* zu tun, deren verschiedene Geltung von Hübschmann, KZ. 23, 398 f. und J. Schmidt, KZ. 25, 118 ff. nachgewiesen ist.<sup>1</sup> Das *kṣ* in ved. *kṣi* = av. *ši* "wohnen" geht auf arisches *č + s* (daraus schon gemeinsam arisch *č + s* oder wie J. Schmidt will *š + s*) zurück, dagegen das *kṣ* in ved. *kṣi* = av. *hši* "herschen" auf arisches *k + s* (daraus arisch *k + s*). Im ersten Falle gehört der Guttural der indogermanischen Palatalreihe (*k*-Reihe), im letzteren Falle gehört er der indogermanischen Velarreihe (*g*-Reihe) an.

Nicht nur im Iranischen sondern auch im Griechischen ist die lautliche Verschiedenheit der beiden Wurzeln gewahrt. Mit *kṣi* "wohnen" hat man längst gr. *κτι-* in *κτίω* "wohnbar machen, gründen, bebauen," *ἐν-κτι-μενός* "wohnlich, wohl gebaut, gut bestellt," *κτι-σι-s* "Besiedelung, Gründung," *ἀμφι-κτι-ονες* "Umwohner" verglichen. Die Lautgruppe *κτ* ist aus der Verbindung

<sup>1</sup> Vgl. ferner Bartholomae, Handb. §100. 147.; Hübschmann, ZDMG. 38, S. 428 ff.

von palatalem *k* (indog. *kg*) mit nachfolgendem *s* erwachsen, wie z. B. in *τέκτων* = av. *tašā*, ved. *tačkṣā*. Die Wurzel *kṣi-* "herschen" ist im Griechischen bisher nicht nachgewiesen. Ihr Guttural gehört, wie wir sahen, der indogerm. *q*-Reihe an, derselben Reihe, wie das *k* in Wz. 3. *kṣi-* "vernichten, umkommen." Letztere nämlich erscheint im Avesta als *h̄ši-* in *h̄šayō* Y. 31, 20, *h̄šayas-ca* Y. 71, 17 (vgl. Bartholomae, Ar. F. II 57) und im Griechischen regelrecht—denn als regelmässige Vertreter der *q*-Reihe dürfen wir im Griechischen die Labialen ansehen—als *φθi-* in *φθiω*, *φθiνω*, *φθiνόθω* "hinschwinden, umkommen, zu Grunde richten," *ἄφθι-ρο-s* "unvergänglich" (=ved. *d-kṣi-ta-s* "unvergänglich") u. s. w. Die Lautgestalt ist im Indischen und Iranischen dieselbe, wie bei der Wz. 2. *kṣi-*; wir dürfen also vielleicht auch darauf rechnen, der Wz. 2. *kṣi-* im Griechischen in derselben Form, d. h. als *φθi-* zu begegnen. Ich glaube, wir treffen sie im Griechischen in dieser Form an in dem bekannten homerischen Beiwoorte *Ι-φθιμος* "mächtig, gewaltig, edel."

*Ιφθιμος* hat eine befriedigende etymologische Deutung bisher nicht gefunden. Die meisten neueren Etymologen (z. B. Bopp, Pott, Curtius, Fick) lassen es ganz bei Seite, und diejenigen, welche sich daran versucht haben (wie Benfey, Wz.-Lex. I 294 f., Duntzer, KZ. 15, 69-71), sind nicht hinausgekommen über die alte Annahme einer Zusammensetzung des in *Ιφι* vorliegenden Stammes mit *τιμή* oder *θυμός*. Aber *Ιφθιμος* hat mit *Ιφι* ganz und gar nichts zu tun, so nahe sich auch beide Wörter tatsächlich in ihrer Bedeutung und scheinbar in ihrer Lautform liegen. Der äussere Gleichklang ist trügerisch. Denn (1) in dem Worte *Ι-φι* gehört das *φ* nicht dem Kerne des Wortes an, sondern die Silbe *-φι* ist suffixal; es ist dasselbe Casussuffix wie in *βίη-φι*, *κράτερ-φι* und vielen anderen Wörtern. Mit dem *φ* von *Ιφθιμος* also, das allem Anscheine nach wurzelhaft ist, steht das *φ* von *Ιφι* in keinem Zusammenhang.

(2) *Ιφι* ist alter Instrumental zu dem Nominative *ις*, der sich bekanntlich nach Laut und Bedeutung mit lat. *vis* deckt. Dieses Wort lautete also ursprünglich mit *F* an, und deutliche Spuren des Digamma liegen bei Homer für den Nominativ *ις* und die ganze zugehörige Sippe vor. Man sehe Knös, De Digammo homer. p. 127 f. "Ιφθιμος" dagegen hat bei Homer nirgends Digamma, scheidet sich also darin deutlich von der zu *ις* gehörenden Wortfamilie. Knös a. a. O. 129 bemerkt: "Ιφθιμος. Nullus locus digamma requirit. Repugnant vero hi: Α 3, Γ 336, Δ 534, Ε 625, Θ 144, Λ 373, Μ 410, 417, Ο 480, 547, Π 137, 620, 659, Ρ 749, Υ 356,

Ψ 260, δ 365, κ 106, μ 352, ο 364, π 89, 244, τ 110, χ 123, ω 26. Ceteros locos hic missos facio." Also an keiner Stelle verlangt das Metrum für *ἴφθιμος* ein anlautendes Digamma und an 25 Stellen verbietet es geradezu die Annahme eines solchen. Ich denke, ein gewichtigeres Zeugnis dafür, dass *ἴφθιμος* kein *F* verloren hat, sondern von Haus aus vocalisch anlautete, können wir kaum wünschen.

Das Feld der Etymologie also darf für das Wort *ἴφθιμος* noch als frei gelten und ich kann mich darauf beschränken, zu zeigen, dass mit der hier vorgeschlagenen Herleitung aus einer Wurzel *φθι-* = ved. *kṣi* und av. *ḥṣi* "herschen, mächtig sein" Lautgestalt und Bedeutung des Wortes in Einklang stehen. Das anlautende *l*- vor der Lautgruppe *-φθ-* ist als vorgeschlagener (anaptyktischer) Vocal zu fassen, entsprechend den *l*- und *ɛ*- vor den ähnlichen Lautverbindungen *-κτ-* und *-χθ-* in *l-κτίνο-s* = ved. *gyend-s*; *l-κτίς* neben *κτίθεος*; *l-χθίς* = arm. *dzukn*, lit. *zuv-īs*, pr. *sū-cka-ns* (Acc. pl.); *ɛ-χθίς* neben *χθίς* = ved. *hyd-s*, lat. *hes-ternus*, *her-i* (aus *\*hes-i*), nhd. *ges-tern*. Dieser vorgeschlagene Vocal kann ursprünglich nicht betont gewesen sein, so wenig wie die gleichartigen Vocale in dem eben genannten *l-κτίς* "Wiesel" (so betont Arcad. 35; nach anderen ist *ικτίς* zu betonen<sup>1</sup>) und in *l-σθί* "sei," falls letzteres, wie man annimmt,<sup>2</sup> aus *\*l-σθί*, *\*σθί* = av. *zdi* hervorgegangen ist. Es liesse sich denken, dass die ältere Betonung *\*ἴφθιμος* gewesen ist, wie *ἴρημος* und *ἴτοιμος* nach der Angabe der griech. Grammatiker früher *ἴρημος* und *ἴτοιμος* betont waren. Aber für wahrscheinlicher halte ich, dass das Wort ursprünglich Oxytonon war, und zwar deshalb, weil die Betonung *\*ἴφθιμός* die Analogie anderer unmittelbar aus der Verbalwurzel durch Suffix *-μό-* abgeleiteter Adjectiva (*θερμός* von Wz. *gher-*; ved. *bhi-ma-s* "furchtbar" von Wz. *bhi-*, *ruk-ma-s* "leuchtend, glänzend" von Wz. *ruk = ruc*) für sich hat. Dabei darf man übrigens auch wol die Frage aufwerfen, ob denn das Wort *ἴφθιμος* wirklich im Griechischen die Betonung hatte, welche wir ihm im Anschlusse an die alten Grammatiker geben. *ἴφθιμος* ist ein speciell homerisches Wort; es begegnet,

<sup>1</sup> Aristoph. Ach. 880 betonen die Herausgeber teils *ικτίδας*, teil *ικτίδας*, teils *ικτίδας*.

<sup>2</sup> Osthoff, KZ. 23, 579 ff. Ganz sicher ist die Annahme nicht, denn ion. *ἴστιν* = *ἴστια*, *χθιζός* aus *\*χθεσ-δγό-ς*, *χτίλιοι* aus *\*χιλιοι* = *\*χέσλιοι* zeigen, dass *ɛ* vor der Lautgruppe *σ + Cons. + i* (od. *j*) zu *i* werden konnte. Darnach könnte *ἴσθι* aus *\*ἴσθι* entstanden sein. Jedoch scheint letzterer Lautwandel sich auf einzelne Dialekte zu beschränken und jüngeren Datums zu sein. Jedenfalls darf man als indogerm. Grundform der II sg. ipr. der Wz. *es* mit O. *zdi* ansehen.

von den späten Nachahmern des Homer abgesehen, nur in der, Ilias und der Odyssee. Woher wussten die alexandrinischen Grammatiker, denen wir die Aufzeichnung des griechischen Accentes verdanken, wie solche Worte zu betonen sind, die längst abgestorben waren und zu jener Zeit in der lebendigen Sprache nicht mehr existierten? Beruht der Accent in solchen Wörtern auf etwas anderem, als auf Conjectur? Haben sie z. B. das Wort *ἴφθιμος* auf der ersten Silbe betont nach dem Kanon, den ein neuerer Grammatiker (Chandler, Greek Accentuation<sup>1</sup>, Oxford, 1881, S. 122) in die Worte fasst: "Adjectives in *μος* throw back the accent"? Oder haben sie der Ansicht Rechnung getragen, dass das Wort eine Composition aus *ἴφι* mit *τιμή* oder *θῦμος* sei, und es demgemäss, wie alle adjektivischen Composita jener Wörter (sie sind verzeichnet in Papes Etymolog. Wörterbuch d. gr. Spr., Berlin 1836, S. 144 u. 150) auf der drittletzten betont, so dass das vermeintliche *ἴφ-θιμος* mit Composita wie *ἐρι-τιμος*, *καρπερό-θῦμος* in eine Linie tritt? Die letztere Annahme scheint mir in der Tat die natürliche, um den überlieferten Accent des Wortes *ἴφθιμος* zu erklären, und ich glaube, wir treten mit ihr den griechischen Grammatikern in keiner Weise zu nahe. Wir dürfen von ihnen nicht mehr verlangen, als was sie zu ihrer Zeit und auf dem damaligen Standpunkte der Grammatik und Etymologie leisten konnten.—Auf jeden Fall also hindert der Umstand, dass das Wort *ἴφθιμος* herkömmlich auf der ersten Silbe betont wird, nicht, das anlautende *ἴ-* als anaptyktischen Vocal zu fassen, einerlei ob diese Betonung der wirklichen Sprache angehörte, oder ob sie—was mir wahrscheinlicher ist—auf einer unrichtigen Etymologie der alten Grammatiker beruht.

So viel über die äussere Form des Wortes *ἴφθιμος*. Was die Bedeutung anlangt, so genügt es zu bemerken, dass die Bedeutung "mächtig," die wir als die Grundbedeutung des homerischen *ἴφθιμος* ansehen dürfen, in dem von *ḥṣi-* abgeleiteten avestischen Adjektiv *ḥṣaya-* wiederkehrt. Das Verbum *ḥṣi-, ḥṣayēti* hat im Avesta die Bedeutungen "herschen, mächtig sein, vermögen; das entsprechende *kṣi, kṣayati* im RV. heisst "herschen, beherschen, vermögen." Es steht nichts im Wege, die Bedeutungen "herschen, beherschen" einerseits und "vermögen" anderseits aus "mächtig sein" herzuleiten und somit der indogermanischen Wurzel, die in ved. *kṣi*, av. *ḥṣi-* und griech. *-φθι-* vorliegt, die Bedeutung "mächtig sein" zuzuschreiben.

HERMANN COLLITZ.

## NOTES.

### META AND ΣΥΝ.

Every Greek scholar will welcome the new edition of Tycho Mommsen's noteworthy treatise on *σύν* and *μετά*, which brought a blush to the forehead of every ingenuous Hellenist when it first appeared in 1874, and made most of us feel that we were not yet fairly in possession of an elementary knowledge of Greek at all corresponding to what would be expected in Latin of a Latin scholar. And yet to this day Greek grammars are published without a hint of the canon that 'μετά is the prosaic *σύν* and *σύν* the poetic *μετά*.' Such matters are beneath the notice of the comparative grammarians who prepare so many of our Greek schoolbooks for us, and in despondent moments the historical grammarian is tempted to echo the lament with which the venerable editor of Pindar closes the preface to the first number of his *Beiträge zu der Lehre von den griechischen Praepositionen* (Frankfurt-a.-M., Carl Jügel's Verlag; London, Trübner & Co., 1886): "Es ist jetzt keine günstige Zeit für die classische Philologie. Ihre Nebenschösslinge Archäologie, Linguistik, Germanistik, Neusprachenthum u. s. w. haben sich—nicht wie mir scheint, zum Heil der allgemeinen Bildung—so blätterreich vorgedrängt, dass der alte Baum, aus dessen Wurzeln sie entsprossen sind, dem Ersticken nahe ist." But, as the results of Mommsen's masterly essay have already found their way into such conservative quarters as Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, it is unnecessary to do more than call emphatic attention to the edition. And yet one is tempted to say a word about the difference between *μετά* and *σύν* where such a difference can be recognized, for, of course, Mommsen himself considers his canon as nothing more than a rough-and-ready guide, and warns his readers that there is an ultimate difference between the two prepositions. Krüger, as is well known, makes *σύν* connote 'coherence,' *μετά* 'coexistence.' This would make *σύν* the closer, *μετά* the wider notion, and the justification of this lies in the fact that in decompound verbs we have *συμμετα-*, never *μετασυν-*, except when *μετά* does not mean 'with'; just as *ἀμφί* is narrower than *περί*, and we have *ἀμφιμετά-*, never *περιμετά-*, except in *περιμφιέννυμι*,

where *ἀμφι-* is almost dead.<sup>1</sup> According to Kühner, who follows Hartung, *σύν* denotes the mere combination of things, mere accompaniment, whereas *μετά* everywhere indicates a close connexion, an inner community, so that each is part and parcel of the other. Evidently there is no reconciling such extremes as these, and the application of Krüger's rule or of Kühner's cannot fail to be a puzzle to the innocent student who should pin his faith to either of these guides. And yet Krüger was a most excellent Grecian. Take a concrete example. Isaios, 3, 68: *σὺν ταύταις* is followed by *μετὰ τῶν θυγατέρων* in precisely the same relation. There is clearly no play for the formula of 'coherence' and 'coexistence,' of 'mere accompaniment' and 'inner community.' The only difference we can discern is that *σὺν ταύταις* is quoted from an old law (οὐ νόμος διαρρήδην λέγει)—cf. 10, 13—*μετὰ τῶν θυγατέρων* is the language of Isaios himself, which corresponds to the language of the inscriptions, in which, according to Meisterhans, p. 107, *σύν* is used chiefly in the sense of 'together with,' 'including.' Here we have, in good Attic time, an apparent indifference in the use which can only be accounted for historically. But all cases are not so simple as that. A synonym may lie dormant through thousands of pages and yet wake up to sting the reader at the last. So we are forced to ask ourselves what is the difference between *μετά* and *σύν*, not in Sophokles, who has, to Mommsen's puzzlement (Ant. 115), πολλῶν μεθ' ὄπλων ξύν θ' ἵπποκόμοις κορύθεσσι; nor in Xenophon, who (An. 2, 6, 18) uses *μετά* and *σύν* (*μετὰ τῆς ἀδικίας . . . σὺν τῷ δικαίῳ*) in a way that is suggestive of climax but may be interpreted as indifference; not in Luke, who uses *μετά* and *σύν* as absolute equivalents in 22, 56 and 59, and also in 24, 29, where climax is impossible; not in Josephus—who, by the way, is not disinclined to *σύν*—for we find in his account of Uriah (A. I. 7, 7, 132. 133) ἀναπαύσασθαι *σὺν αἴρῃ* side by side with ἀναπαύεσθαι *μετὰ τῆς γυναικός*, where subtlety loses its rights, but in an Athenian of the second century after Christ, who emphasizes the distinction with as much certainty as δι' ὅν and δι' οὐ are distinguished in Hebrews 2, 10. In his Legatio

<sup>1</sup> Other compounds might seem to furnish good traps for *μετά* and *σύν*; *μετά*, for instance, showing itself in διμέτρος 'partner,' *μετονομα* 'participation,' while δισύνον 'companion,' and *σύνονομία*, in all its range of signification, would provide for *σύν*. But how shifting such lines of demarcation are we can see from English 'company,' the members of which bifurcate into 'companions' and 'partners.'

or *Supplicatio* (31, 157) Athenagoras says *πεπεισμέθα . . . βίον ἔτερον βιώσεσθαι . . . ως ἀν μετὰ θεοῦ καὶ σὺν θεῷ . . . μενοῦμεν*, and the worst of it is Athenagoras has a way of making such points (see my note on Justin Mart. Apol. I, 23, 11), and the points are all fairly justified by idiomatic usage. The context seems to demand that there should be a climax, that *μετὰ θεοῦ* should be nearly equivalent to *παρὰ θεῷ* 'in God's presence,' 'in Heaven,' while *σὺν θεῷ* means 'in the light of his countenance,' just as *σὺν θεῷ* would in ordinary parlance mean 'with the blessing of God,' 'by God's help' or 'grace,' a consecrated phrase, which survives even where *μετά* has pushed *σύν* out of doors, as *dans* has pushed *en* out of doors (A. J. P. VII 405). Let us now take a long step backwards from Athenagoras to Homer. According to Mommsen's statistic *ξύν* or *σύν* (for we cannot undertake to discriminate here) occurs 181 times in Homer, 107 times in the Iliad, 74 times in the Odyssey, showing a decreasing ratio; but in the Iliad things form the majority, in the Odyssey persons. How shall we interpret this? Are things personified or persons reified, to coin a necessary word, or is *σύν* indifferent? There is much, in my judgment, in favor of considering *σύν* a personal preposition, the extension of which to things was due to the vividness of the early world of thought. We certainly cannot depress so ancient and sacred a phrase as *σύν θεῷ* to anything lower than a personal level, and when Mommsen says that the signification of 'belonging to' split itself into two sides, the one 'mit Zuthat von,' the other 'mit Hilfe von,' he introduces a bifurcation which was not in the minds of the early speakers. There was no difference in conception between *σύν τεύχεσι* and *σύν θεῷ*. The distinction is purely modern. What we regard as subordinate, as a mere appendage, was not such to the primitive man. The man's weapons, horses, chariot, were an extension of his individuality, and the feeling is by no means dead, as is attested by the proper names given to arms, to coaches, to vessels, and by the affectionate feminine pronoun so often employed in familiar English of utensils of all kinds. Körner begins his 'Schwertlied' by the invocation 'Du Schwert an meiner Linken,' and warms up to 'ich liebe dich herzinnig, als wärst du mir getraut, als eine liebe Braut.' The primitive warrior, whether in the East or in the West, needs no such warming up. Now, of course, as the language became colder, the use of *σύν* with things gave more color than it could have given in a world

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Luke 23, 43; *σήμερον μετ' ἐμοὶ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ*.

where everything was alive, and hence, as I said in the Introduction to Pindar, xcvi, ‘*σὺν* makes the tool an accomplice’; but that is true, of course, only for the period when the tool was not *ipso facto* an accomplice. That *σὺν* survives in business phrases may be a mere matter of the persistence of formulae, and yet we who know that in a bargain ‘including’ and ‘y compris’ are potent factors may see a deeper meaning in the retention of *σὺν* in such a passage as Isai. 6, 33: *αλγας ἀπέδορο σὺν τῷ αἰπόλῳ τριῶν καὶ δέκα μνῶν* (cf. 8, 35). A strong argument in favor of the personal character of *σὺν* is the fact that *σὺν* is the only preposition that has no discernible locative meaning; and what if its dative were not the locative dative, but the dative proper, and *σὺν* really a pseudo-preposition? But this note must not be allowed to grow into an article, and I would only observe in conclusion that Mommsen has taken no notice of Bachmann’s correction of the veteran’s count of the *σὺν*’s and *μετά*’s in Aristophanes. It seems that Mommsen has counted *μετά* (for *μέτεστι*) in Eccl. 173 as a preposition, whereas we must read with Bachmann (*Coniecturae Aristophaneae*, p. 106), *μετά* 84 (not 85) and *σὺν* 22.<sup>1</sup>

B. L. G.

#### ON A PASSAGE IN THE CIRIS.

In reading over Mr. Ellis’s very suggestive article upon the Ciris, which appeared in the last number of the Journal, I find myself unable to accept as final the reading proposed by Unger for v. 94:

Pierides, quarum castos alvearia postes  
Munere saepe meo inficiunt.

<sup>1</sup> We are not disposed to question Mommsen’s figures, though work of this sort breeds distrust and recounting would do no harm. Small margins may be covered by textual differences. Mommsen’s 49 *σὺν*’s in Acts have been verified in a poor text, but if we follow Tischendorf<sup>8</sup> or Westcott and Hort we must add two (7, 35: *σὺν χειρὶ ἀγγέλον*, and 16, 32). Two independent searchers have made out 36 of Mommsen’s 40 *μετά*’s in the Acts, but this number is further diminished by 20, 24 and 24, 7 of the better texts, a curious reinforcement of the abnormal tendency. Luke has, it seems, some 24 (23) *σὺν*’s and 50 (49) *μετά*’s, thus shifting the weight as compared with Acts. Little importance, however, is to be attached to this in view of the desultoriness of the usage, there being no instance of *σὺν* in Luke between 9, 32 and 19, 23. Common to both books is the disinclination to use *σὺν* with things. In Acts *σὺν* is not used with things at all except in 7, 35, and that hardly counts because a person is meant; and Luke uses it as an Attic might not have blushed to use it, once in the business phrase *σὺν τῷκῳ* (19, 23)—cf. Isai. 1. c.—and once *σὺν τῷ κλαυθίῳ* (5, 19) ‘bed and all.’

The MSS all read *altaria*, which cannot be kept. Heyne proposed *violaria* or *topiaria*, with no approximation to the MS reading. Sillig proposed *libamina*, taking *altaria* to be a gloss for *postes* which had crept into the text. Haupt's *calparia* and Bergk's *alabastria* have been sufficiently discussed by Mr. Ellis. Unger, while he shows that honey was offered to the Muses, adduces no passage to prove that it was customary to anoint *postes* with it. What was used in the anointing of *postes*? Plainly *adeps* of various kinds, as will be seen from the following passages: Pliny, N. H. 28, 135, *Proxuma in communibus adipi laus est, sed maxime suillo; apud antiquos etiam religiosus erat; certe novae nuptae intrantes etiamnum sollempne habent postis eo attingere* (Sillig's text). One may infer from Pliny's words that the early religious use of *adeps* was not confined to the bridal ceremony. In §142 of the same book he says: "Masurius palmam lupino *adipi* dedisse antiquos tradidit, ideo novas nuptas illo perunguere *postis* solitas ne quid mali medicamenti inferretur." Servius, Comm. Aen. IV 458, refers to the same custom, varying the expression: "moris enim fuerat, ut nubentes puellae, simul venissent ad limen mariti, postes antequam ingredierentur, propter auspicium castitatis, ornarent laneis vittis . . . et oleo ungerent"; and in the additions of Daniel, *solere postes unguine lupino oblinci*, compare Isidorus, IX 7, 12, and Martianus Capella, II 149, but especially Arnobius, III 25, where, referring to the goddess Unxia, he says: "nisi postes virorum *adipali* unguine oblinerentur a sponsis . . . Dii nomina non haberent." *Adeps* is commonly regarded, although not without dissent, as a word borrowed from the Greek ἀλειφα, ἀλειφαρ (so both Weise and Saalsfeld), and although the Romans seem early to have changed the *l* to *d*, still in the popular pronunciation the *l* was retained, for in the Appendix Probi, p. 199, 2 Keil, we are directed to write 'adipes non alipes.' The Greek ἀλειφαρ was used not only for fat, but for any unguent or anointing oil. I conjecture, therefore, that the poet, perhaps under Greek influence, wrote *aliparia* = *adipale ungen* of Arnobius, which a scribe, not understanding, changed to *altaria*. There are a goodly number of borrowed Greek words in the Ciris, among them *sophia*, *peplum*, *tropaeum*, *storax*, *psalterium*, *chorda*, *haliaaetos*, *crocota*, *spilaeum*, *cumba*, and, if the ingenious emendation of Mr. Ellis to v. 161 be accepted, *coritus*.

It may be worth while to inquire in this connection whether the editors have not been too hasty in reading *adipatae* for *adipale*

in Cic. *Orator* 8, relying solely upon the testimony of Nonius (p. 69). The MSS read *asciverunt aptum suis auribus optimum quoddam et tamquam adipale dictionis genus*. We should naturally expect the adjective following *et* to agree with *genus* as *optimum* does, and it may be noticed that Lambinus read here *adipatum*. Compare Cic. *pro Arch.* 3, *novo quodam et inusitato genere dicendi*; *Piso* 48, *nova quaedam et inaudita luxuries*; *Phil. IX 10*, *nec vero silebitur admirabilis quaedam et incredibilis ac paene divina eius in legibus interpretandis, aequitate explicanda scientia*. If Cicero used the adjective *adipalis* = *aliparis*, the author of the *Ciris* may well have used *aliparia*.

MINTON WARREN.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

**De Contractionis et Synizeseos usu Homerico scripsit Ios. MENRAD. Monachii, 1886. Pp. 216.**

No more striking example of the tendency of recent Homeric criticism can be adduced than the effort to expel from the text of Homer vowel-contractions and synizeses. As early as the days of Bentley *ιμιν μὲν θεοί*, A 18 (cf. § 251), grated on an ear not unaccustomed to this synizesis in the Attic poets; and the conjecture of the "modern Aristarchus"—*ιμμι θεοί μὲν*—has now found a place in the edition of Christ.

The violent resolutions of contract forms in the edition of Payne Knight excite more curiosity than respect, though his text contains not a few acceptable emendations (e. g. κ 240, *εἰν νόος*; Σ 140, *γηθέει ἐν*). With Bekker the tendency to avoid contractions did not assume the pronounced character of later times. Bekker was on the scent for instances of violated *F*, and did not shrink from *kai uiv φωνήσασα Φέπει*, as he did not from *δίνεον ὁς, χρήσεον, ἀφρεον*. As the desire to disturb the serenity of traditional possession grew apace, there arose scholars like Nauck, who substituted the uncontracted for the contracted forms whenever etymology and the rhythm of the verse permitted—that is, when the contracted syllable was in the thesis. By the adoption of this canon Nauck was the first to attempt the enforcement of a "blood-and-iron" rule which, if carried into uniform practice, would have deprived the poet of any liberty of choice. But it was not till the advent of Fick's *Odyssey* that Homeric scholarship began to recognize the ultimate consequences that might be drawn from the rigorous enforcement of the doctrine of avoidance of contractions; especially when cases of contraction which refused all emendation were proclaimed to be the work of a particular individual, Kynaethus, an Ionian of the sixth century.

Contemporaneous with this hunt after uniformity on the basis of a separation of our text into an Aeolic and an Ionic Homer, is the mediating effort of Christ, whose scholar, Menrad, has now given to the world the most thorough-going, as it is in many respects the most satisfactory, treatise on this subject that has yet appeared.

Any investigation which deals with vowel-contraction in Homer must have a twofold aim: it must strive to attain a more exact knowledge of the laws of the hexameter, while it respects the laws already known, and it must indirectly hope to prove a powerful factor in the effort to determine the age of particular portions of the *epos*.

The difficulties in the path of the investigator are numerous. In the first place, contractions which appear to be criteria of the younger portions of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* uncharitably reappear in portions which have been fixed upon by the consentient verdict of scholars as of earlier date. Again, the language of the earliest bards may have permitted metrical licenses to an

extent indeterminable by us; or the rhapsodes may have preserved open syllables as archaisms when their contraction was an accomplished fact for their own day. These and many other difficulties beset Dr. Menrad in the course of his study; nor is he unaware of their variety or momentousness.

The lines on which he attacks the problem may thus be summarized: Contractions and synizeses are, as a rule, absent from the older portions of Iliad and Odyssey. Their presence is to be regarded as a proof of more recent origin, except (1) when metrical reasons necessitate a contraction of too great a concurrence of short vowels in a word that would otherwise have been banished from epic use; or (2) when the contracted syllable occurs at the end of the hexameter (but Menrad refuses to make use of this exception to explain *Aχιλλεῖ*, Ψ 792; cf. p. 17); or (3) when the contraction occurs in the chief caesura of the verse. Vowels originally separated by *yod* contract with greatest readiness, less frequently those between which  $\sigma$  has been expelled; but the loss of *F* is followed by contraction in comparatively few instances. Vowels of cognate nature contract easily (*πληθνί, τεθνάσι*), as do those of different weight (*πασέων*), but those of different coloring or of equal weight contract with less freedom (*ἐνίκαον, ἐπέρθεον*).

In his reply to the strictures of Müllenhoef on his *Sprachschatz*, Grein delimited with admirable precision the functions of a critic who differs on principle from the views which he has been called upon to submit to examination. Here, if ever, the critic must not use as a weapon against the details or elaboration of a theory any objection to the theory as a whole that may be with him a matter of philological conscience. Scholars of the beliefs of Ludwich will thus condemn as a whole a volume which aims at carrying the principles of Christ to their ultimate results, and which regards Nauck's position as but slightly removed from that occupied by the Munich professor. But others, whose consciences are seared by the resolve to break away from the trammels of tradition, will be more sympathetically inclined to an investigator who seeks to formulate laws on the basis of so reasonable a position as the mediating one of Christ. The latter class accept the attempt as a possible one, and will find reason to object to errors of judgment only in the working out of the theory or to mere errors of detail.

Among the latter the reviewer begs leave to count himself; and with the greater satisfaction, as in a treatise written now some four years ago (*Der Diphthong EI im Griechischen*) he had occasion to deal in part with the same problems discussed so ably by Dr. Menrad. In the course of an investigation of the diaeresis in Homer the reviewer proposed (p. 42), on the basis of a complete collection of material, the following law, which has been accepted in some quarters in Germany: *ei* from *εοι* (not from *εFι*) is contracted to *ει* in Homer only when a short syllable precedes and follows this *ει*. All passages (and they are very few) that are not in harmony with this statement have (1) either already been condemned or are to be condemned as of later origin, or (2) are to be corrected if their genuineness is not, on other grounds, elevated beyond the possibility of a reasonable doubt. It is a matter of satisfaction to the reviewer that this conclusion is in part the same as that reached by Dr. Menrad, who had not seen the above-mentioned pamphlet. The conjectures which he suggests in order to introduce *ei* into the dat. loc. sing. of the -*ει*-stems are the same as those previously made by the reviewer, with the exception of  $\gamma$  91, where for

*εἰ τε καὶ ἐν πελάγει μετὰ κίμασιν Ἀμφιτρίτης, εἰ τε καὶ ἀμ πέλαγος* was suggested; cf. ε 330, ὡς τὴν ἀμ πέλαγος ἀνεμοὶ φέρον ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα. Menrad, however, suggests *ἐν πελάγεσσι*. In one point, however, Menrad's opinion differs. Accepting the resolution in *ἀεικεῖ, ἀφνεῖσ, ἥθειος*, he excuses forms like *ἥριγένεια, τέλειος* on the ground that they occur at the end of the verse. *ἥθειος* K 37; *ἀφνεῖσ* I 483, he explains as evidences of the later origin of K and I; and adopts the same excuse for *ἀφνειότεροι, a 165; ἀφνειστατος, Υ 220; τελειστατον, Θ 247, Ω 315*. But for *ἀφνεῖσ*, Ε 9 (*Δάρης ἀφνειδίς ἀμύμων*), he can give no explanation. Here, I hold, it will be necessary to read *κρατερὸς καὶ ἀμύμων* (cf. γ 111, Σ 55) since, whenever *ἀφνεῖσ* occurs in conjunction with *ἀμύμων*, καὶ is interposed (cf. a 232). I agree with Menrad as regards a 165, Υ 220, I 483 (Düntzer rejected 481-484 on other grounds), but in the case of *τέλειος*, Α 66, Ω 34; *τελειστατον*, Θ 247, Ω 315, and in the case of *Τριτογένεια*, which is omitted by Menrad, I still prefer to see the operation of the above-mentioned law. If my position be correct, Menrad has not utilized his material to the best possible advantage. But this is a point of comparatively slight importance. I prefer to follow him in regarding *καταπρηνεῖ*, Π 792, ν 164, as a poetical license, than to accept Fick's *καταπρανέ ἔλασας* in ν 164 (Aeolic *καταπράνε* *ἔλασας*). Fick rejects Π 648-804; *προαλεῖ* Φ 262 belongs to the *μαχὴ παραποτάμος* and *'Ενπειθεὶ* occurs in ω 465.

The exhaustive collection of material is arranged under the following heads: Declension of nouns and pronouns; verbs in -ω, -εω; future and subjunctive; -ει, -εο, -εο; verbs in -οω; verbs in -μι; ειμί; isolated examples of more remarkable contractions and synizeses. An introduction discusses the labors of his predecessors, an epimetrum contains an impatient attack upon Ludwich, of whose set he exclaims, perhaps unjustly: *Sed frustra ad rationes revoce homines, qui rationes ut eludant, doctrina et acumine utuntur.* Finally, the weaknesses of Fick's practical application of his Aeolic theory are emphasized by several, to my thinking, well-timed objections.

Menrad submits to an examination each case of contraction in Iliad and Odyssey, and to those passages which, in his judgment, need curative treatment, offers both his own emendations and those of other scholars. To many of the several hundred suggestions which are the result of his fertility of resource in conjectural emendation we must award our assent (so, for example, *εἰέργον*, Π 743, for *εἰεργέος*; φ 178, *ἐκ δὲ στήστος ολσε μέγαν τρόχον*), and to most at least the verdict of subtlety. But it soon becomes apparent how easy it is rewrite Homer in the light of any one theory enforced by the "Reign of Thorough," especially if we lessen our burden by assuming the irresponsible position that it is not necessary to account in each case for the source of the traditional reading.

It was no new fact that vowels are far more frequently contracted in the later than in the earlier portions of the *epos*. It is only when the antiquity of a passage is in dispute that the utmost delicacy of touch is pre-eminently necessary. Herein the editor as the investigator, whose functions are often widely divergent, should agree; and herein Menrad has failed to display that *finesse* of criticism without which investigations of purely grammatical scope must ever be barren of lasting results. Conjectures in a text which is a mosaic of the lost lays of different epochs should be made only under the following

conditions: (1) when the forms are non-Hellenic and caused by the ignorance of transcribers or of redactors who were devoid of any finer sense of Homeric form; (2) when the laws of the hexameter suffer a patent violation;<sup>1</sup> (3) when the sense imperatively demands another reading. With all due reverence for the Königsberg school, there is room and verge enough for the adoption of many ancient forms from those MSS which do not contain mere conjectures of the scribes.

And again: if we break away from MS tradition we may introduce archaic forms, not because they are archaic, but because an examination of all the parallel cases in the light of the most exact study of the age of the different portions of the *epos* warrants their adoption. It is in violation of this latter principle that Menrad has committed his great, and let us add his only, fault of any ulterior consequence. With all his desire to gather results for the age of different passages of the poems (cf. pp. 62, 89, 134, 137), the thraldom of a single guiding principle has vitiated a vision otherwise keen and well trained. But for the proofs! Ψ 792 Menrad reads *πόσο'* ἐριδαίνεσθαι ἀλλοιο' εἰ μὴ 'Αχιλλῆι in a passage indisputably of later date (the personal construction of ἀργαλέος is here impossible). 'Hoῖς is to be excused, according to Menrad, from its place in the Telemachy (δ 188), but *αἰδοῖς* must be corrected (v 171), as if *v* was older than *δ*. *ο* is indirectly asserted to be of greater antiquity than *η*, since in ο 533, *ἱμετέρον δ'* οικ ἔστι γένεν<sup>τ</sup> βασιλεύετερον ἀλλο, for γένεν<sup>τ</sup> we must read γένος; *θέρεν* occurs in η 118 (description of the gardens of Alkinoos). We had cherished the belief that the appearance of Helen in *ο* savored somewhat of a later age, but even the isolated *νεῖσθαι* (*ο* 88)—there are 55 cases of *νεῖσθαι*—must be corrected; and that when the whole environment is redolent of a later age (e. g. either v. 65 or v. 80 must be spurious). *οικ ιθ'* δμῶς τιμῆς ἔσεαι πόλεμον περ ἀλαλκῶν in the oration of Phoenix, well known as occurring in a later insertion, I v. 605, is to be emended to *τίμος οβκέθ'* δμῶς ἔσεαι, πόλεμον περ ἀλαλκῶν. In the *Shield of Achilles*, Σ 475, καὶ χρνόν τιμῆντα καὶ ἀργυρον becomes τιμῆντά τε χρνόν ιδ' ἀργυρον. The later origin of Iliad IX is ignored and Menrad's aim to separate the older from the later lays vitiated by his conjectures I 315 ('Ατρείδην πείσειν 'Αγαμέμνον' διώ), I 337 (τι δέ Φει), Ω 290 (ἀλλὰ σύν' εἰχ' ἔπειτα), despite Ω 287 εἰχεο. The fact of the existence of *εἰχεο* and *εἰχεν* in such close proximity proves, that for the period in which Ω was composed, both forms were a portion of the apparatus of the poet. In the Elpenor scene, λ 61 is emended from *ἀσε μέ δαιμονος αλσα* to *ἀσεέ με Διός αλσα*, because δαιμονος *αλσα* occurs nowhere else (*haud scio an religione ductus is sit qui culpam a Iove in semideum quendam infernum transferendum esse censeret!*)

It is, perhaps, no difficult matter to catch a conjectural critic at variance with himself. But the following is so glaring a case of inconsistency that it well deserves the words of Cauer: *Ich behaupte nicht dass so entgegengesetzte Wirkungen an sich unmöglich seien; aber sie müssten in jedem einzelnen Falle erst bewiesen werden, nicht sie selbst können als Beweismittel für eine weitere Annahme verwertet werden.* Menrad emends B 328, ὡς ἡμεῖς τοσοῦντ' ἔτεα to ὡς ἡμεῖς τόσα μὲν Φέτεα, the rare *το(σ)σοῦτος* (I 485, Ψ 476, and here) having expelled the more common *τόσος*. For δφρ' εἰδῆς, Θ 420, etc., long an irritant to *F* hunters, ὡς

<sup>1</sup> A distinct weakness of Menrad's conjectures is that he does not shrink from the trochaic caesura of the fourth foot, which occurs only fifteen times in A-O.

*Τιδέης* is substituted, as if a partially final particle as *ως* (Il. 31, Od. 32 times) could have been displaced by the more frequent *δόρα* (Il. 117, Od. 120 times), even though we take into consideration the fact that *ως κε*, *ως ἀν* are more frequent than *δόρα κε*, *δόρα ἀν* (A. J. P. IV 423 ff.).

Pursued without greater discriminative insight, treatises similar to Menrad's must ever recall the admirable words of Moriz Haupt (quoted by Kammer, *Neue Phil. Rundschau* 1887, No. 8)—*Absolut ist in der Kritik alles zu verwerfen was nicht nothwendig ist; mit Möglichkeiten hat die Wissenschaft nichts zu thun, darum muss man sich vollkommen unempfndlich verhalten gegen den Reiz sogenannter geistreicher Kombinationen, sonst artet die Wissenschaft, die ein Suchen der strengen Wahrheit sein soll, in ein Spiel der Phantasie aus.*

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

The Sequence of Tenses in Latin. By WILLIAM GARDNER HALE. (Reprinted from the American Journal of Philology.) 1887.

In the last number of this Journal Professor Hale completed his essay on the Sequence of Tenses in Latin, in which he advocated the thesis that the 'tenses of the Latin subjunctive, alike in dependent and in independent sentences, tell their own temporal story, that no such thing as is meant by the doctrine of the Sequence of Tenses exists.' The thesis is not new, the principle on which the thesis rests is not new. What is new is the amplitude, the fervor of the presentation. I leave to other hands the discussion of the individual examples by which Professor Hale has undertaken to fortify his position, and content myself with a few remarks on the general principles involved.

Doubtless the doctrine of the Sequence of Tenses is often badly stated. The grammarian often sacrifices exactness to brevity. He says 'case' when he means 'case-form.' He says 'tense' when he means 'time.' He says 'governs' when he means 'is construed with.' He says 'follows' when he means 'is associated with.' All that the doctrine of the Sequence of Tenses means is that when you have to do with present or future time you use the so-called principal tenses of the subj.; when you have to do with past time you use the so-called historical tenses of the subjunctive; and that as the subjunctive is chiefly used in dependent sentences, the point of view is regularly given by the principal clause—with due regard to the attraction of parenthetical clauses, with due regard to the shifting of the conception. Granted that the principal clause has no direct effect on the subordinate, this coincidence is every way worth noting, and in the absence of a more satisfactory theory of the temporal relation of the subjunctive than prevails just now, it has a practical use that is not to be despised, apart from considerations to be afterwards adduced. Even as a rule of thumb it has a far wider sweep than one would suppose from the exceptions that Professor Hale has brought forward—many of them dear old friends that we have long valued for the vividness with which they protest against the tendency of language to run into grooves, against that ovine tendency so marked in the human race, and not less marked in the grammatical tribe than in the other sorts and conditions of men. A patient German, Heynacher by name,<sup>1</sup> has been at the pains of counting the sequences

<sup>1</sup> I quote from Fügner (Fleck. Jahrbücher, 1887, Paedag. Abth. S. 115). The second ed. of Heynacher's book is not accessible to me.

in Caesar's Gallic War, and finds, leaving out the consecutive sentence, that 840 instances are regular, 36 are exceptional, and of the consecutive sentences—the worst 'sports' in the language—128 are regular and only 11 are irregular. But such examples will not avail with those who wish to get back into the transcendental region of parataxis, and who maintain that hypotaxis has no rights that a grammarian should respect. Now, the explanation of hypotactical constructions by reversion to the original parataxis is far from being a new method. It has been applied times without number to the elucidation of obscure phenomena, and it is especially potent wherever the logical sequence is unhinged, wherever the passions intervene. Without admitting the survival of parataxis there is no explaining, for instance, the constructions of the verbs of fear. But there is danger of carrying the thing too far.<sup>1</sup> Why, an attempt has actually been made to show that *πρίν* with the inf. is a paratactic construction, as if anything could be more hypotactic than the inf.<sup>2</sup> And yet, absurd as this is, it is not a whit absurd than claiming direct paratactic origin for such a use of the subj. as we find in the dependent interrogative wherever that subj. represents the indicative, in which case the subj. follows, if I may use the expression, the same rule with the infinitive. In *oratio obliqua* after a principal tense *erat*, *fuit* are alike represented by *fuisse*. What the language might have done is shown by the construction of *memini* with the pres. inf., is shown by the Greek use of the pres. inf. after a principal verb, after which it sometimes represents—varying with various authors—the imperf. indic.<sup>3</sup> Now just as *erat* and *fuit* are represented by *fuisse*, *erat* as well as *fuit* is represented by *fuerit*, and to maintain that every *fuerit* if turned into the independent form would become *fuit* would give a proportion of aorist and perfects entirely unparalleled in the language. There are hundreds of passages in which any sound feeling would restore the imperfect ind. in the direct discourse. Cato may be considered an unsuspected witness, and Cato says in the opening of his *de Agri cultura*: *Quanto peiorem civem existimarent foeneratorem quam furem, hinc licet existimari.* That this *existimarent* would be replaced by the imperf. indic. in *oratio recta* is clearly shown by: *Et virum bonum cum laudabant, ita laudabant, bonum agricolam bonumque colonum. Amplissime laudari existimabatur, qui ita laudabatur.* However, there can be hardly any dispute on this point. The phenomenon has simply been disregarded.

That this subjunctive representing the indicative is different in its effect from the paratactic subj. seems to be self-evident. It stands distinctly parallel with the indicative. 'BA. *Quid ab hac metuis?* Pl. *Quid metuam, rogitas?*' (Pl. *Bac.* 65). Such a *Quid metuam?* is no parallel to the true subj. *Quid metuam?* and the famous example *Quaero a te, cur C. Cornelium non defendarem* (Cic. *Vat.* 2, 3) has no application here. That is an original subj., and hypotaxis, if there be a real hypotaxis in the passage quoted, has no effect on it. If Cicero had said *cur non defendem* then there would have been dependence, and the difference between *cur non defendi?* and *cur non defendebam?* would have been effaced, in favor of the clearer form. Every one knows how this subj., representing the indicative, spreads as we go

<sup>1</sup> See A. J. P. IV 419, Brugmann, Gr. Gr. p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> A. J. P. II 473.

<sup>3</sup> A pretty, perhaps a significant, shift occurs in *Lys.* 12, 26. 27, in which (§ 26) ἀντιλέγειν φήσι represents ἀντέλεγειν and is followed (§ 27) by φάσκων ἀντεπειν.

down in Latin. If we can judge by Greek the construction is due to false analogy; but it had taken much deeper root in Latin at the beginning of our record than the corresponding construction (opt.) had taken in Greek during the early period: but, whatever its origin, once set fairly afloat it got itself a tense-scheme that is not identical with the use in the paratactic sentence. In the paratactic sentence the durative is not swallowed up by the perf., by the aor. We do not sacrifice the beautiful differences which are flattened into a unity by the weight of hypotaxis, so flattened that the few exceptions cannot count in any reasonable scheme of grammar.

We must not be frightened by hard words, by the German cry of 'mechanical dependence' which Professor Hale echoes. Call it 'mechanism,' call it 'instinct,' call it 'habit,' call it 'tendency,' call it 'drift'—there is a non-reasoning, imitative element, hardly to be dignified by the name of 'analogy,' that we have to recognize in everything human; and if our rules are mechanical, they are no more mechanical than the people who used the language, and by destroying the mechanical rule we lose, as I have hinted, the delight in the non-mechanical. But if we can get rid of the mechanical altogether by a satisfactory theory of the temporal relations of the subjunctive, so much the better, as life is always better than mechanism, provided, however, we can live at all without mechanism in some form or other. Still, the trouble is that at some very important points this paratactic restoration, which gives the inner life, breaks down hopelessly. I leave on one side the dependent interrogative subj., already referred to, I leave on one side the Greek opt. representing the ind., which clearly grew out of false analogy, and I ask 'Who can explain paratactically the obstinate sequence of pres. and imperf. subj. in the final sentence?' The final clause is a hypotactic imperative subj. Now the paratactic imperative subjunctive has the four tenses, present and perfect, too common to need proof, imperfect and pluperfect (so-called jussive), for which the grammars may be consulted (e. g. Dräger, I<sup>2</sup> 309); the hypotactic imperative or final subj. has only the two sequences, present and imperf. Why should the language stick in this wooden way to the eternal *ut* and *ne* with the present and imperf. subj. when there was no end of paratactic *ne* with perf. subj. all around, to say nothing of an occasional pluperf.? Exceptions occur under the influence of passion, perhaps under the influence of Greek, in which language the final delights in aoristic turns, but the drift has set in and we have to acknowledge a closer relation between leading clause and dependent clause than the character of the thought would seem to warrant. To this extent there is mechanism.

Professor Hale attacks the consecutive sentence with a light heart. That I do not find it so easy I have elsewhere confessed,<sup>1</sup> and I must acknowledge that I suspect Greek influence in *ut* with aor. (perf.) subj., which matches too well the exceedingly common *δοτε* with aor. inf., though I cannot exclude the possibility of the deadening of the potential by the example of a merely formal subjunctive like that subjunctive which represents the indicative in the dependent interrogative.

As to the importance of the paratactic method there is no difference between Professor Hale and myself. But as hypotactic mood is not always identical with paratactic mood, as hypotactic tense is not always identical with paratactic

<sup>1</sup> A. J. P. VII 164.

tense, I think he goes much further than the facts of the language warrant. The consecutive subj. may be a potential—that is the explanation of it given in my grammar (§543, 4)—but the subj. which represents the ind. in an interrogative clause has no such coloring. From my point of view it is better to resign, with Professor Goodwin, any attempt to define the opt. than to undertake to identify the *oratio obliqua* opt.—i. e. the optative that represents the indicative—with the potential optative. From my point of view the German subj. in *oratio obliqua* has an entirely different function from the subjunctive of direct discourse, though it may have been suggested by it. All the potentiality that it has lies in the foreign personality to which the responsibility is shifted. And as for English, my English consciousness tells me nothing about 'may' and 'might' except that I use the one habitually after a present tense, the other after a past tense. If I reverse the rule, I am conscious. I go back to the original parataxis, according to which both 'may' and 'might' belong to the present, for 'might' outside of the hypotactic sentence has almost ceased to belong to the past, and needs the reinforcement of 'have' in order to get back to its old kingdom. But this 'repraesentatio' is far from natural in English, and though it is suggested over and over by Greek, it is very harsh except in the case of the solitary subjunctive 'be,' in which the old construction has survived, probably on account of the ambiguity of 'were.' But these matters I have already touched in my articles on the final sentence. I have there maintained that it was a mistake to give up the old rule of sequence in Greek,<sup>1</sup> and I have also maintained that we are not to confound the impoverishment of linguistic means with the conscious simplicity of art—the 'repraesentatio' of Herodotus with the banishment of the opt. from the final sentence in the New Testament.<sup>2</sup> Our fine old translators, using in their mechanical way 'may' and 'might,' render 2 Cor. VIII 9: *δι' ιμᾶς ἐπτάχεντε πλούσιος ὅν, ινα ιμᾶς τῇ ἐκείνον πτωχείᾳ πλούσιοντε* by 'Though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor that ye through his poverty might be rich.' An Atticist might insist on 'may become rich,' but we are very much afraid that the point would have been lost on St. Paul.

B. L. G.

Die Kunst des Uebersetzens fremdsprachlicher Dichtungen ins Deutsche, von TYCHO MOMMSEN. Frankfurt, 1886.

This is the second edition of a work which appeared thirty years ago. The author emphasizes the universal character of literature, the perils of national isolation, and the need of constant intercourse with foreign thought and form. It follows, then, that the study of language ought to go hand in hand with poetry. Moreover, to make a still broader basis for native work, foreign masterpieces ought to be translated. There are three kinds of foreign influence: (1) "Stillose Uebersetzung," where no effort is made to preserve the form of the original; such failures as Schiller's stanzaic translation of the *Aeneid* may be instanced, though it is quite unfair for Mommsen to call Coleridge's *Wallenstein* "die Rache für den Schillerschen Macbeth." (2) Original work is done in a foreign form and style (Klopstock, Platen). (3) "Stilhafte Uebersetzung," where matter, form and style are all adequately translated. The author, we are glad to note, declares himself strongly for this last method,

<sup>1</sup> A. J. P. VI 68.

<sup>2</sup> A. J. P. VI 64.

though he acknowledges its difficult side. He confines the possibilities of translation, so far as German is concerned, to the Indo-Germanic group. He then treats the separate problems of translation—displaying a pre-Sylvestrian acquaintance with phonetic syzygy—and the special difficulties of each language. He praises his mother-tongue in an eloquent passage, and rightly calls it the one universal language which takes all the rest to its heart. But translations are not to be final; and the author insists on general study of the modern languages—a matter of more concern in 1858 than now. Lastly, he gives a number of clever translations from several languages. It is a little distressing to see the honest German lyric muse, always a trifle grandmotherly and *hausbacken*, making such effort to be young and giddy and reckless as in our author's rendering of "Green grow the Rashes, O!" But why should not a patriotic German avenge his Goethe and his Heine? An appendix gives some paragraphs on Shakspere and Marlowe, taken from a larger work soon to be published; and also a number of passages translated from the latter playwright.

F. B. G.

**Chapters on English Metre, by JOSEPH B. MAYOR, M. A. London, C. J. Clay & Sons, 1886.**

Believing in a scientific treatment of metres, Professor Mayor has written this book for the needs of students of English verse. At least, one infers this from the opening sentences of the preface. At the same time the author denies all intention of putting forth a regular treatise; and he leaves untouched many of the subjects usually discussed in a book of this kind. Among these, unfortunately, is the historical consideration of our metres. Admirable as we must call much of our author's work, ingenious in analysis, patient in sifting of material, copious in illustration, this absence of an historical sense for English verse renders his conclusions more or less uncertain. It is no safe theory that Professor Mayor lays down when he says (p. 3) that he will treat his subject "from the purely scientific side" without any "reference to historical . . . considerations." Surely no treatment of English metres can be scientific unless it is at least based on these "historical considerations." Hence, there is much more satisfaction in reading the purely analytical chapters—like that on the verse of Browning and Tennyson—than those in which the author gives us his theories of verse. In the early chapters Mayor rightly rejects Guest's "antiquarian apriorism"—though it is protesting too much when one spends twenty-one pages on an exploded theory, makes some just criticisms on Abbott's "logical apriorism," confutes Symonds' "aesthetic intuitivism," and finds Ellis and his new verse-tests somewhat too radical. Mayor's own position is a sort of enlightened conservatism: with the old school, he "scans" his verses, and is all for "feet"; but he has profited by recent investigations (in English) and knows the importance of pauses and balances. As a result, his scanning is far more satisfactory than that of his predecessors, and his minute analysis of a great variety of verses deserves thankful recognition. In the chapter on Surrey and Marlowe, however, the analysis is without its necessary background of historic study; and, indeed, throughout the book one is constantly feeling and regretting this defect in a work based on such industry and guided by such taste.

F. B. G.

## REPORTS.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK. Dritter Jahrgang.

Heft 3 u. 4.

Pp. 309-28. Die Sprache Priscillians. Georg Schepss. Priscillian was beheaded in 385. Eleven treatises by him have recently been found in a Würzburg uncial codex of saec. V-VI. He may be considered a Spanish writer. The Biblical passages quoted by him differ in their text both from the Itala and Vulgata. The orthography is quite fully treated. We can give here only a few features. *b* and *v* are often confused, *zabolus* = *diabolus*, *Zeu* = *Iehu*, *Zesu* = *Iesu*. Insertion of consonants, *thensaurus*, *occansio*, *Istrahel*; leaving out of consonants, as in *mesura*, *susum*, *eclesia*. *m* and *h* are sometimes added in the wrong place, and sometimes omitted; prosthesis is seen in *aesternatio* and *exspectaculum*, *e* and *i* are frequently interchanged; *obaudiendum* occurs for *oboediendum*. In many cases the prepositions *ad*, *con*, *in*, etc., are not assimilated.

Declension and Conjugation. *Animabus*; *pascha*, which is often n., makes *paschae* gen., and *pascharum*, *argutia*, *tenebra*, *inlecebra* occur as sing. forms; *fluctuus*, *pastuus* as nom. and acc. pl.; *mortalis* is used as substantive = *homo*; *nullae* and *solae* in dat.; *nefarius* is used as comparative; *hi*, *hiis* = *hi*, *his*; *quisque* = *quisquis*; *interpraetari*, *loqui*, *metiri*, *obtrectari* are employed as passives. There are several verbs in *izo*, and numerous inchoatives, including *pigrisco* and *putresco*; *ex abundanti* = *abunde*; *per occulta* = *clam*.

Syntax and Style. Most of the prepositions are used regularly, but sometimes there is a confusion of cases, *absque* with acc.; *propter* is more frequent than *ob*; *similis* always has the dat., as in archaic Lat., and *dignus* occurs with dat. In the government of cases by verbs there are many peculiarities: *credere* is found with dat., with acc., and *in* with acc. as well as abl. The moods also are much confused, the subj. being used without apparent reason, and *cum* taking the indic. where we should expect the subj. In most indirect questions, however, we find the subj. Some cases are cited of *ut* with the infinitive. *Etsi* is very common, taking alike indic. and subj.; *quamvis* takes the place of *quamquam*; *quoniam* and *quia* are used in object clauses after *scire*, *intelligere*. Priscillian makes large use of participles, especially of the present active, which is used in the nom. absolute and in the abl. absolute, often to introduce a citation, as *dicente profeta*. A list of peculiar words is taken up, some 21 of which are not given by Georges.

P. 328. *Capsella*. B. Kübler. In Porphyron ad Hor. Ep. 2, 1, 123 read *Siliquas aut specialiter dicit eas quae in arboribus nascentur, aut generaliter pro omni legumine, quod siliquis hoc est capsellis (for asellis) continetur.*

Pp. 329-36. The construction of *utor*, *fruor*, *fungor*, *potior* in early Latin. P. Langen. Some errors, long current, are corrected, and more exact statistics

given. Plautus regularly uses *utor* with abl. There are but three or four doubtful cases in MSS where the acc. may have stood: with a neuter pronoun, as *Merc.* 145; with a gerundive, as *oculos rogo utendos*, *Mil.* 347; cf. *Asin.* 444, *Rud.* 602, *Aul.* 96, 311, 400; *Curc.* 603, *Men.* 657, 658 f., etc. *Usus est* has also abl. in all except one passage. Cato's usage rather favors the abl., with a few examples of acc. *Abutor*, however, has acc. in Plautus, Cato and Terence. After Terence the acc. seems to have come again into favor with *utor*. *Fungor* in early Latin always takes acc. (17 examples given); the abl. in *Ter. Ad.* 603 is doubtful. *Fruor* also has acc., but was used earlier than *fungor* with abl.; cf. *Asin.* 918, *hac frui*. Terence more commonly has abl., but acc. *Haut.* 401. *Potio* as active takes acc. + gen., in the passive the gen. As a deponent in *Naevius*, Plautus and Terence the acc., but the abl. is also found in Plautus, Terence and Afranius. *Compotire* takes abl. twice in *Rud.* 205 and 911. A few examples are given from inscriptions.

P. 336. *Inormis* is considered by L. Havet a case of popular etymology for *enormis*, and not for *innormis*.

Pp. 336-54. The Subjunctive of the Future. Felix Hartmann. The inadequate and inaccurate treatment of most grammars is noticed. The periphrastic form is not so infrequent as is commonly represented, and occurs in Cicero most frequently in indirect questions, then in relative clauses (77 ex.); causal and concessive sentences (*cum* 39, *quod* 8) altogether 52 ex.; clauses with *quin* (39); conditional sentences with *si*, *nisi*, *etiamsi* (35); consecutive with *ut* (25), after *quasi*, *tamquam*, *ac si*, *quam*, *secus*, *atque* (9), after *ne* (6), after temporal *cum* (2). Long lists of examples are given and their bearing discussed. The periphrastic form is found after verbs of fearing and striving, but not after verbs of *demanding*, *happening*, nor in *final* and *temporal* clauses, with rare exceptions. As a rule the periphrastic form is sharply differentiated in meaning from the present and imperf. subj.

P. 354. K. E. Georges points out that *pityon* ( $\pi\tau\upsilon\omega\nu$ ), pine-forest, must be received into Latin (and Greek) Lexica from *Martial*, 12, 50, 1.

Pp. 355-87. Historical and Geographical Proverbs. A. Otto. A mere list of the historical and geographical names which are here treated as forming the subject of proverbial sayings would be very tedious, whereas the article itself is most interesting, and, as the writer remarks, a comparison of the genuine Roman proverbs and of those which have been borrowed from the Greeks often reveals striking differences in the national characters. The *levitas Graecorum* is often contrasted with the Roman *constantia* and *gravitas*. *More Romano loqui* is to speak frankly, without evasion, as opposed to *fides Punica*. It is a little remarkable that so few places in Italy itself have become associated with proverbs.

Pp. 384-87 contain some addenda and corrigenda to the article on mythological proverbs by the same writer.

P. 387. Wilhelm Schmitz contends that *crumelum*, already discussed in *Archiv* III, p. 286, while = *grumellum*, must be retained as an example of archaic orthography, as in the *Notae Tiron.* *tab.* 62, 29 *crumilum* occurs, and the abbreviation *C(v)Rum* = *crumellum*.

Pp. 388-97. Further contributions "Zu den Tiersprichwörtern," by A. Otto. A great many new proverbs and passages are added.

P. 397. C. Wagener would exclude *refirmare* from the Lexica, and read after the best MSS *reformatus* in the *breviarium* of Festus, but we do not understand his remark "*Reformatum* wird freilich bis jetzt in den Lexicis nicht erwähnt."

Pp. 398-442. On verbs in *issare* and *isare*. A. Funck. These verbs are for the most part essentially borrowed words which have been Latinized. A few belong to the earliest period, some were introduced by reason of their convenience by medical writers, but by far the greater number are to be credited to Christian authors who, rather than give to Latin words a new technical meaning, preferred to adopt words which were in common use in Greek, thus *evangelizare* and *baptizare*. For the early period and down to the time of Augustus the testimony of grammarians establishes the form in *ss*. For new words afterwards introduced the form in *izare* seems to have prevailed, with trifling exceptions. Often in Greek there is no corresponding verb in *-içω*; sometimes a verb deponent in Greek assumes the active form in Latin, as in *ἀγωνίζεσθαι*, *agonizare*, *rheumatizare*, etc. Many verbs in *-izo* have as parallels verbs in *-ew*. For *prophetizo* a shorter form *prophetare* is used by Irenaeus, Tertullian, Commodianus and Ambrosius. *Comissari* is an inexact rendering of *κομιάζω*, influenced, perhaps, in form by *con-itari*. Other analogical forms are discussed. Even Latin prepositions were sometimes prefixed, perhaps first by Irenaeus, *praeatechizo*, *praeevangelizo*, and Cyprian *rebaptizo*, which afterwards became very common. In Ambrosius *coagonizo* and *superagonizo* occur. Peculiar are the verbs which have a purely Latin origin, as *vibrizzo*, *certissio*(?), *exopinizzo*, *pulverizo*, *latinizo*, *carcerizo*, *singularizo*, *auctorizo*, *ligonizo*, *hilarisso*, etc. Very curious are *delibergmatizant* = *dogmatizant*, and *magarizandum* after *μακαρίζω*. The verbs are then classified under the following heads: *A.* Verbs of the heathen literature; (*a*) archaic period, (*b*) medical terms, (*c*) technical expressions of profane writers. *B.* Verbs in Christian writers. The article concludes with an alphabetical list of 143 verbs.

P. 442. Fr. Vogel gives several examples from the *Epistulae Pontificum* of *corriger* used in reflexive sense, as in Italian *corregere* = *corregersi*. In Ennodius, p. 303, 22, *corrigit* ought to be read for *corrigitur*.

Pp. 443-57. Alliteration and Rhyme. Further contributions by Wölfflin to the article in the first volume of *Archiv*. Although much attention has been paid to alliteration in the last decade, the limits of its use are not well understood. More attention ought to be given to the part which it plays in composition, as in *velivolus*, *foedifragus*, etc., and to cases like *permutat ac miscet*. A remarkable instance of alliteration is seen in Venantius Fortunatus, in the conclusion of his *Vita Sancta Marcelli*: *qua pietate parcitate, dilectione dulcedine, humiliitate honestate, fide fervore vixerit*, etc. The popular tendency to such alliteration is seen in the Fr. *frais*, *fier*, *fort*, and in the Germ. *frisch*, *froh*, *frei*. A long list of such alliterative combinations, arranged alphabetically, is given. In the matter of rhyme as an element of style much caution is necessary, as it may occur where not especially intended. It cannot be doubted that Augustine, for emphasis and effect, made more frequent use of rhyme and

paronomasia than his predecessors, as e. g. *bellum vestrum latet, amicitia patet*. An alphabetical list of some thirty rhymes from different authors follows.

P. 457. Samuel Brandt points out two more future infinitives in *uiri* in Lactantius, Inst. I 6, 13, *nominatuiri*; IV 17, 3, *datuiri*.

Pp. 458-70. *Medietas, Mitte, Hälfte*. Wölfflin. *Medietas* is first found about the end of the second century A. D. and in the sense of *middle*, out of which afterwards developed the sense of *half*, as Fr. *moitié*, Ital. *meta*. Cicero, *Timaeus* 7, says *non enim audeo dicere medietates*, which is evidence enough to show that it was not a classical word. Cicero uses *mediocritas* or *medium* as substantive. Apuleius uses *medietas*, as he is the first to use *nimietas*, but the jurists Ulpian, Paulus and Papirian do not adopt it. It is used by Tertullian, Arnobius and Porphyrio, and accordingly seems to have arisen in African Latinity. In the fourth century the confusion of *medietas* with *dimidietas* began, although Chalcidius, the translator of the *Timaeus*, uses it correctly some fifty times. Palladius, Ammianus and Vegetius all use it in the sense of *half*. Even Diomedes thus uses it, and Macrobius and Martianus Capella, although in some passages it still retains its earlier meaning. In inscriptions of the Empire, *half* seems to be regularly rendered by *dimidia pars* or *dimidium*. Among medical writers Scribonius Longus and Celsus follow the classical usage, while the later writers have also the second meaning. Among the jurists this does not appear until the Codex Theodosianus, where *medius* is also used for *dimidius*. Boethius, in his mathematical works, uses frequently *medietas* = *half*. In the Romance languages only this meaning has been perpetuated, and for some of the late Latin writers of France and Italy *medietas* = *middle* seems to have become obsolete.

P. 470. *Toti* = *omnes*. Wölfflin asks: "How far was the Romance substitution of *toti* for *omnes* anticipated in Latin?" In Caesar and Hirtius there are three examples of *totae copiae*. Gaius uses *totorum bonorum* where Cicero uses *omnium*. *Totis visceribus* is cited from Venantius Fortunatus.

Pp. 471-94. *Abdere, Abditus, Abdite, Abditivus*. A very complete lexical treatment by Thielmann.

P. 494. *Competere* = *compotere*. The Sallustian and Tacitean usage *non animo-auribus-lingua competere* is compared with such expressions as *compotem mentis, mente, animi, animo*, and the suggestion made that perhaps there was an earlier *compotere* = *compotire* and this was afterwards confused with and merged in *competere*.

Pp. 495-506. Addenda lexicis latinis. 150 words beginning with *p*, 8 with *q*, 53 with *r*, 106 with *s*.

P. 506. Consonant-assimilation. Wölfflin. Forms like *ammirari* in late MSS are very common, but it is hard to determine in many cases whether the writers themselves so pronounced and practised assimilation in writing. Pliny frequently uses *adalligare*, so that he could hardly have written or heard pronounced *adligare*. That *dissimilis* entirely took the place of *absimilis* in later Latin seems to show that both *absimilis* and *adsimilis* were pronounced *assimilis*.

Pp. 507-31. Vulgärlateinische Substrate romanischer Wörter. G. Gröber.

Beginning with *Lacusta*, this list is carried down to *mille*, over ninety words being embraced, some of which are very interesting, both for the forms adduced and for the light thrown upon hidden quantities.

Pp. 532-4. *Nachträge*, by Ph. Thielmann, to his articles in the second volume of *Archiv*, on *habere* used with inf. and perf. part. pass. *Calvaster* (Wölfflin), until now only found in glossaries, must have been used in the first century A. D., as we find, Dio Cass. 67, 11, *νεανίσκος Ἰούλιος Καλονάστρος*.

Pp. 535-62. *Miscellen*. Some 23 short articles, of which we can give here only the headings: Sprachliches zu Sallust, Edmund Hauler. *Menetris, meneris*. *Fundibalum, fundibalarius*. *Netura, nectura*. *Mascarpio*. *Contrire (irari)*, by Ph. Thielmann. *Exsternare, externare*, Joh. Meltzer. *Simila, similago*. *Volutina*, Ed. Lubbert. Zu den Hisperica famina, R. Thurneysen. *Factum=fatum*, J. Huemer. Zu den Differentiae Sermonum, J. W. Beck. On the forms *duos* and *duo* in Plautus, Studemund. *Cogitare*, K. Hofmann. *Calamizo, poetizo* u. a., A. Funck. *Quid est?* and *Quid id est?* in Terence, F. Schlegel. *Istuc ago*, and the dual in -ere, Havet. *Adventare, circare* and *igitur*, Wölfflin. *Visere* and *Lupus in Fabula*.

Pp. 563-91. *Reviews of the literature of 1885-6*.

Pp. 591-4. Appreciative notice of the late Carl Schaper.

The volume concludes with the "Jahresbericht der Redaktion," from which we learn with great regret that there is every prospect that the fourth volume of the *Archiv* will be the last, the organization being insufficiently provided with funds for the further satisfactory prosecution of the work. The editor has been most untiring in his efforts, and has borne much of the expense himself, while the labor involved in correspondence and in the organization of so large a body of co-workers must have been immense. The results secured have been most valuable, but give us only a foretaste of what might be accomplished if the plan of the thesaurus could be carried out to its completion. We trust that the offers of further assistance, pecuniary and otherwise, will be so numerous as to encourage the editor to persist in the undertaking for a few years longer at the least.

MINTON WARREN.

ANGLIA. *Zeitschrift für englische Philologie*. Herausgegeben von RICHARD PAUL WÜLKER. IX Band, 1 Heft. Halle, 1886.

This number opens with the text of Lydgate's version of the fables of *Æsop* according to the Harleian MS. No. 2251, edited by P. Sauerstein:<sup>1</sup>

Vnto my purpos this poyet laureat,  
Callyd Isopos, did hym so occupy,  
Whylom in Rome, to please the senat,  
Founde out fabules, that men myght hem apply  
To sundry matiers, that echman in his party,  
After theyr lust to conclude in substaunce,  
Dyuers moralités set out to theyr plesaunce.

<sup>1</sup> Sauerstein's dissertation, "Ueber Lydgate's *Æsopübersetzung*," Halle, 1885, must be consulted for the literary history of this version of fables which, having never been published, has hitherto been little known.

Abt *Ælfric's Angelsächsische Bearbeitung des Buches Esther*, by B. Assmann, follows. This article is an *editio princeps* of an Anglo-Saxon version of the Book of Esther, with the corresponding text of the original in Latin. Assmann, in the preceding year, published a dissertation on the subject of this Esther, presenting a minute study of the age and authorship of the piece, and promising an early publication of a critical text of the same. We have here a fulfillment of that promise, with, however, an element of incompleteness that unfortunately defers the closing section of the work to an indefinite future: "Die hierzu gehörigen anmerkungen werden später folgen." Some facts drawn from Assmann's dissertation will best serve to quicken an interest in the text now printed. In the Bodleian Library there is a manuscript, Laud. E 381 (formerly Laud. 33), that belongs to the first half of the seventeenth century. It consists of a collection of various Anglo-Saxon tracts, transcribed, and, as if ultimately intended for publication, accompanied by translations into the English of that day. All this is the work of William L'Isle's own hand. The third of these tracts, "Be Hester," is the only known copy of the Esther, L'Isle's original being even yet undiscovered. Dietrich, while collecting material for his famous investigation of the *Ælfric* question, made a personal examination of this manuscript, and without hesitation attributed the Esther to *Ælfric*. Assmann has at this point taken the matter up and made of it a special problem. He has investigated the character of the Anglo-Saxon version in its relation to the Biblical original; its style, its rhythmic structure, its language. In every particular he finds conclusive evidence of the correctness of Dietrich's judgment, that L'Isle's transcript gives us a copy of the work of which *Ælfric* makes mention in his treatise on the Old Testament in the following words: *Hester seb cwæd, þe hire kynn dhreddde, hæfð eac dne boc on þisumzelē, for þan þe zodes lof ys zelozod þær on; þā ic onwende on Enzlice on ure wisan sceortlice.*

Assmann contributes in the next article, Abt *Ælfric's Angelsächs. Bearbeitung des Buches Hiob*, a collation with the manuscript of Grein's edition of *Ælfric's* version of the Book of Job (Bibliothek der Angelsächs. Prosa, I 265-72). This is also one of the tracts preserved to us only in the transcript of L'Isle, Bodl. Laud. E 381. Grein based his text entirely on the edition of Thwaites (1698); this collation, therefore, leading us back again to the manuscript, has considerable value.

The fourth article, by A. Zetsche, occupies many pages (43-194), and is also an edition of a text: *Chronik des Robert von Brunne*. 5383 lines of the Chronicle are given, which extend from the beginning of

Alle the story of Inglaunde,  
Als Robert Mannyng wryten it fand.

to the birth of Christ,

For now is born our saviour,  
Now ys us toward joye and blys,  
That of a mayde this child born ys.  
Al mankynde schal he save,  
Jhesus, that name schal he have.

The text is according to the Lambeth manuscript 131, with variant readings

and supplementary passages from the only other known manuscript, that of the Inner Temple.

Sarrazin (pp. 195-204) contributes two notes on the *Béowulf*: "Die Beowulf-sage in Dänemark," and "Beowa und Böðvar." The writer aims to bring forward additional testimony in proof of the correctness of his views respecting the source and the relations of the saga, and the location of the scene in the first part of the epic as announced in a previous article: "Der Schauplatz des ersten Beowulfliedes und die Heimat des Dichters" (P. u. B. Beitr. XI 159-83). In refutation of the linguistic side of Sarrazin's argument the reader must consider Sievers, *Die Heimat des Beowulfdichters*, ib. XI 354-62; to which Sarrazin replies, ib. XI 528-41; and again Sievers, ib. XII 168-200). Sarrazin now finds in the *Hleiðargarðr* (= Lejregård) of Rolf Krake's saga a surprising confirmation of his previous argument in favor of Lejre, Seeland, the adventures of Böðvar Biarki resembling those of *Béowulf*. A translation of the remarkable adventure of Böðvar and of the timid Hött (afterwards named Hialti) is given to show a resemblance in events that is worthy of attention. We are next reminded that *Saxo Grammaticus* has also something to tell of Biarco (= Böðvar Biarki) and Hialto, in which, as is urged, further agreements with the incidents of the poem cannot be denied; so, for example, the death of King Atislus at the hands of Biarco is but *Béowulf's* slaying of Eadgils (l. 2396 f.). *Saxo's* account of King Frotho and the witch is also referred rather to the Grendel episode than, as according to Müllenhoff, to the fight with the dragon. From these proofs for the ultimate identity of *Béowulf* or *Béowa* and the Norse Böðvar, Sarrazin advances a step further and argues for a like identity of name. This correspondence is not indeed according to the regular laws of the relationship of the idioms involved, but Sarrazin allows a wide margin for popular disturbance in phonetic changes, and brings himself to believe that while *Bauðvar* would yield A. S. *Béawar*, *Béowar*, whence, by the omission of final *r*, conceived to be a foreign ending of the nominative case, *Béowa*; so also, on the other hand, the final syllable *-var* came to be regarded as equivalent to *-vargr*, and was therefore translated *-wulf*. However the name *Béowulf* may have arisen, it is certain that Sarrazin's theory will not hold. Sarrazin's closing note is, however, chiefly devoted to the enforcement of the thought that the Böðvar and *Béowulf* saga must be studied anew in its relations to the *Ornit* myth and legend, retracing all lines of tradition in the common cycle to the basal myth and cult of Frey and Balder.

We next come to *Bemerkungen über Spenser's Shepheard's Calendar und die frühere Bukolik*, contributed by O. Reissert. It is a brief comparative study of the pastoral poem with special reference to Spenser's *Calendar*. In the introductory paragraphs the doctrine is announced that this variety of poetical composition is essentially conventional and traditional. The poet does not deal with a life that he has himself lived, or even observed; his scenes and incidents are stereotyped artificial material; his art is largely constrained and imitative. Allegory comes to the rescue of this severe art-form and makes possible the introduction of other sentiments and ideas. The bucolic may thus, as at the hands of Vergil, become a court and political poem; the personality of the poet is veiled in a Tityrus, a Menalcas, a Sylvius or a Colin Clout. Having attained to the admission of public and of private events, the

way is paved to satire and to panegyric. True to tradition, when notions of religion are introduced Olympus supplants the Christian heaven. In Boccaccio satyrs, not angels, sing the praises of the 'Lamb'; Spenser refers to the day of doom in the following manner:

"When great Pan account of shepheards shall aske."

After some remarks on the 'composition' of a number of idyls into a bucolic cycle, Reissert proceeds to a somewhat detailed study of the relations of Spenser's 'months' to the sources, supplying also abundant and interesting parallels from Vergil, Mantuan, Petrarca, Boccaccio, Marot, Sannazaro, etc., that, by virtue of the traditions of the art, argue coincidence rather than conscious imitation or borrowing. In the case of the "Morall Aeglogues" Reissert finds occasion to modify the results previously reached by Kluge in an article that must be kept in mind in this connection (Anglia, III 266 f.).

Sattler gives us the twentieth instalment of his *Beiträge zur Präpositionslehre im Neuenglischen*, dealing with locative phrases of the type 'at, or, in the University'; 'at, or, in the South'; 'at, or, in London,' etc.

Of exceptional interest is the closing article of this number: *Gerefā*; Einleitung, Text und Wörterverzeichniss, hrsg. v. F. Liebermann. *Gerefā* is the title given to an Anglo-Saxon legal tract which is here for the first time brought to light; it is found in the Corpus Christi Coll. Cambr. MS. 383, where it immediately follows the curious and valuable *Rectitudines singularum personarum*, of which Liebermann believes it to be a continuation, a second part, by the same author. Remembering that this same manuscript, besides being an important source for the Laws, preserves to us the only known copy of the A. S. *Rectitudines*, it becomes a matter of conjecture how the *Gerefā* could so long have escaped the antiquarian student. Liebermann observes that the *Gerefā* is not found in the *Vetus Versio*, but we cannot know why this should be; more unaccountable still is the fact that Thorpe passed it by. The latter made direct use of the manuscript, and was impressed with the character of the *Rectitudines*, of which he said: "This piece is valuable, as presenting us with an enumeration of the several classes of persons employed on a domain, of the services to be rendered by each, and of the reciprocal duty of the lord to those engaged on his land" (Ancient Laws and Institutes of England, p. iv). Liebermann also ventures to suggest that the Latin translator and Thorpe alike may have found in the obscure terminology of the *Rectitudines* a satiety that quieted further curiosity for a second chapter even more distressfully difficult. Thorpe certainly in a measure exposed himself to such a charge when he offered his impression that the *Rectitudines* were "hardly susceptible" of an English translation, as an apology for substituting the Latin version. The *Gerefā* contains but nineteen brief entries, and is critically edited, annotated and translated by Liebermann. The student of "Institutions" will welcome this additional light on the functions of the Reeve, and on other attendant relations in the agricultural economics of England about the time of the Norman Conquest. This newly rescued document has, moreover, a very peculiar interest for the English lexicographer. Many words cited in A. S. and Modern English dictionaries as 'due to Somner, but unauthorized,' are here rediscovered. From Somner's entries of oblique forms which agree with the *Gerefā*,

and from a longer citation s. v. *odene* (*on odene cylne macian*), it cannot be doubted that he made use of this manuscript, although he also omitted some words in it which to this day have not found their way into the lexicon. The standing reproach against Somner has thus been shaken, and the presumption raised that he never entered on his lists an "unauthorized" word.

In an appended letter Prof. ten Brink takes it upon himself to correct Leonhardt in statements made with respect to Levy's indebtedness to others in his studies of the sources of Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

NEUE JAHRBUCHER FÜR PHILOLOGIE UND PAEDAGOGIK, 1885.

Fascicle I.

1. Geschichte des Altertums, von Eduard Meyer. Erster band. Geschichte des Orients bis zur begründung des Perserreichs. 1884. xx u. 647 S. Review by Gelzer. This first volume shows excellent work and the results of recent scholarship. It does not destroy the value of Duncker's great work, excepting as late editions may hurt earlier ones. The history is divided as follows: History of Egypt to the end of the Hyksos period; old Babylonian history; the Semites, Asia Minor at the time of the Egyptian conquests; the period from the end of the twelfth to the middle of the ninth century; the Assyrians; the Iranians.

2. Ueber die ἀπαγωγή in attischen Gerichtsverfahren. M. Sorof. S. opposes the view of Meuss, that the ἀπαγωγή could be enforced only in case of criminals detected ἐπ' αἰτοφόρῳ. It could be employed, in cases of murder, not merely against aliens, but also against citizens.

3. Anz. von Porphyrii quaest. Homericae, ed. H. Schrader, Fasc. II. A. Römer. S. believes that the ζητήματα Vaticana give an entirely incorrect idea of the work of Porphyry, as a whole. They are, however, genuine extracts from P. culled by an excerptor.

4. Homerisches. [*νότα διηνεκέα*.] M. Zucker. This expression refers as much to the quality of the special portion of meat given to Ajax and Odysseus as to the quantity. It is nothing more or less than the favorite "loin steak" of the modern kitchen.

5. Χίμαιρα—*alyęç*. O. Rossbach. The fabled Χίμαιρα is a personification of a volcano in Lycia of the same name, mentioned by Pliny. Cf. the term *alyęç*, which Aristotle says was popularly applied to a kind of meteor.

6. Zu Antiphon. Moriz Schmidt. Being remarks on the text in several places.

7. Zu Plutarchos. F. L. Lentz. Three emendations.

8. Zu des Quintus Smyrnaeus Posthomerica. A. Zimmermann. Textual criticism of a large number of passages.

9. Memmius im Gedichte des Lucretius. A. Kannengieser, Lüneberg. In the Jahrbücher, 1882, pp. 833-7, K. sought to prove that the name Memmius always occurs in such parts of the fifth book as are later additions to the

"carmen continuum," and are not in the plan which the poet gives in the introduction to the book. This had already been prepared for publication, when Lucretius enlarged it so as to include mention of Memmius. On the other hand, I. Bruns (Lucrez-Studien, Freiburg, 1884) held that the entire poem had been written for Memmius, that he received special mention only in the first book and then steps more and more into the background, so that, though occasionally mentioned, he gives way to the great circle of the poet's readers. For the present paper the question is whether the reverse be not the case, that Lucretius first wrote for the public and then recast the work for the sake of honoring his friend Memmius. This K. seeks to answer by proving for the first and second books what he holds concerning the fifth, that in no main passages of the poem is any direct or indirect notice of Memmius taken.

10. Zu Terentius. Braune, Berlin. Critical contributions to the Eunuchus, Phormio, Haut., and Hecyra.

11. Zu Tacitus. Draeger, Aurich. A note on Ann. III 58. Comp. Ov. Met. V 273, XI 434.

12. Die Träger des Namens Hermagoras. O. Harnecker. The numerous notices of rhetoricians and philosophers named Hermagoras all refer in reality to two men. Hermagoras the Elder, mentioned as a Stoic philosopher by Suidas, and as the founder of systematic rhetoric by Cicero, Quintilian and others, flourished about 180 B. C. Hermagoras the Younger, a rhetorician, mentioned by Suidas, Strabo and others, lived at the beginning of the reign of Tiberius.

13. Die Sagen von der Geburt der Athene und Aphrodite. P. Stengel. The myth of Athene's birth directly from the head of Zeus must be of late origin. Originally she was probably regarded as the daughter of a sea-goddess; cf. *Tritogéneia*, and was reared beneath the waves until fully grown. The story of her springing in full beauty from the foam of the sea was afterward transferred to Aphrodite.

14. Noch einmal die Aigis bei Homeros. P. Stengel. S. cites A. 32 ff., and E. 738 ff., in support of his view that the *aiγις* was a shield, and not the skin of an animal.

#### Fascicle 2.

15. Nautisches zu Homeros. A. Breusing. A vigorous attack upon the received meaning of a number of Homeric words. Most important are *στείρη*, *πτορφύρεος*, *ιοειδής*, *ἡραιειδής*, *ιστοι* (ζ 271); *σπείρα* (ζ 268); *έφοδλκαιον* (ξ 350); *δρυδάχοντς* (τ 574).

(4.) (Continued.) Homerisches. P. Stengel. Discussion of the meaning of *λερήιον*, *τελήεσσα* (έκατόμβη), *τέμνειν* (of victims), *άγνωστον* (ν. 191).

16. Zu Ciceros Brutus und Orator. Heerdegen, Erlangen. This communicates the important information that the copy of the Brutus made from the Codex Laudensis (now lost) by Flavius Blondus is really in existence. It was found in the Vatican, Ottobonianus 1592. From this were made the copies of the Brutus which still exist. The discovery of this copy of Blondus (— B) is almost as important as the discovery of the Laudensis would have been.

17. Zu Quintilianus. Kiderlin, Nürnberg. Critical notes on twenty passages in the first five books.

18. Zu Livius. Harder, Berlin. A textual criticism on I 21, 4. *Et soli* is all that remains of *inca] pitoli[ο]*.

19. Die siebente ode im vierten buche des Horatius. Probst, Münster. This poem is recognized as essentially a spring-song. One may account for the sad tone which prevails in certain of the lines by noticing how it is true that different poets draw different lessons from the approach of spring. To Horace it suggests the contrast of life and death, the perpetual renovation of Nature, and man's passing away into perpetual night. A very good translation closes the article.

Fascicle 3.

20. Die psychologie des ältern griechischen epos. W. Schrader. A careful study of the meaning of the different terms relating to the soul and its functions, as found in Homer, the Homeric Hymns, and Hesiod. In φρένες the idea of the activity of the reason predominates, while θυμός includes the realm of feeling and will. Among the numerous terms whose meaning is discussed are φρήν, ψυχή, θυμός, στήθος, ἡπορ, νόος, νόημα, βούλή, μῆτις, μένος, and others.

21. Zu Artemidoros. O. Keller. A brief textual note.

22. Pausanias und Strabon. L. v. Sybel. Parallel extracts from Strabo and Pausanias, showing a remarkable similarity in matter and arrangement. The author hints at a common source, through Apollodorus and Artemidoros.

(7.) (Continued.) Zu Plutarchos. C. Stegmann. Criticism of the text of several passages.

23. Zu Theokritus. Ziegler, Stuttgart. The Urbinas 140 does not read, for the superscription of the first eidyllion, Μένακος αἰπόλος, as Ahrens has it, but μεναλκας αἰπόλος.

24. Zu Plautus. Brix, Sorau. The good work already accomplished by Brix as a student of Plautus renders interesting the present contribution. The notes are all critical and are mainly on the Mostellaria and the Rudens; there are two on the Cistellaria.

25. Zu Ciceros Cato Major. Meissner, Bernburg. Some valuable and suggestive critical notes.

26. Zur characteristik des verfassers der Rhetorica ad Herennium. R. von Scala. This is essentially in accord with W. W. Fowler (Journal of Philology, 1882, 197-205), that the author was of the party of the people and the Italian allies, in the period from the Gracchi to the Civil War. The Rhetorica is a satire on the Sullan faction, exceedingly bitter, the work of a contemporary speaking with eloquence and with anger over the failure of wholesome efforts at reform.

27. Zu Caesars Bellum Gallicum. Conradt, Stettin. On the translation of *cuius rei nulla est occultatio*. Nägelsbach and Haack (Stilistik<sup>3</sup>, p. 30) render *occultatio* 'power to conceal.' The sentence really means, in its connection,

'in this respect, in matters of the sexes, there was no painstaking concealment among them.'

Fascicle 4.

28. Zur chronologie der Platonischen Dialoge. H. Siebeck. An elaborate effort to settle the order of the dialogues from internal evidence, and particularly from references backward and forward from one to another. The conclusions reached give the following order: Charmides, Republic I (about 394), Republic II to IV 18, Laches, Protagoras, Gorgias, Phaidros (about 390), Menon (about 395), Phaidon (?), Republic IV 19 to IX (about 388), Symposium (about 385), Menexenos (about 387), Theaitetos (after 365), Sophistes, Politikos, Philebos, Parmenides, Laws.

29. Anz. von W. H. Roscher's Lexik. d. gr. u. röm. Myth. 1-5. P. W. Forchhammer. A short notice, chiefly commendatory.

(4.) (Continued.) Homerisches. H. Scotland. S. would retain  $\epsilon$  486 unchanged, but in  $\epsilon$  542 he would write  $\pi\acute{e}\delta\eta\tau$  for  $\theta\acute{e}\mu\omega\tau$ .

30. Zu Xenophon's Anabasis. R. Bünger. Comments on I 10, 9 f., and III 4, 19-23.

31. Zu Sallustius. Opitz, Dresden. Critical notes; two on the Catilina, five on the Jugurtha, and one on Hist. II 41 D (*or. Cottae*).

32. Horazische massivität. Plüss, Basel. An analysis of the purpose, poetic situation and subject of Carm. II 5. Happily there is none of that tediously minute analysis which one is tempted to think Plüss is sometimes guilty of.

33. Zu Tacitus Dialogus. Walter, München. A critical note on §37 ad fin. in the Dialogus. For *velint* read *elevent*.

34. Zu den Berner Lucanscholien. Hagen, Bern. A valuable supplement to Usener's *Commenta Bernensis* (Leipzig, 1869).

Fascicles 5 and 6.

35. Die glaubwürdigkeit des Thukydides, geprüft an seiner darstellung der belagerung von Plataia. Hermann Müller-Strübing. A very interesting article of sixty pages. The author believes the history of Thukydides to be a "martialisch-didaktische epopoe," and carefully sifts the details of the siege of Plataea for proofs of his theory. He finds many statements which he thinks to be manifestly fictitious, and makes out, it must be confessed, a strong case.

36. Der Boiotische doppel-kalender. A. Schmidt. A supplement to the author's comprehensive discussion of the Attic double calendar, in the Jahrb. for 1884. In the present article he discusses the lunar calendar of the period of Meton, and of the previous period, with a view to elucidating the meaning of two Boeotian inscriptions, at Tanagra and Orchomenos respectively.

37. Zu Theokritos Hieron. J. Beloch. The date of the Hiero is fixed at 262 or 263 B. C., or about ten years later than hitherto supposed.

38. Zur lateinischen grammatis. Procksch, Eisenberg. I. *tantum abest* followed by *ut . . . ut*. This construction is not found in Caesar, Nepos, or

Sallust; but in Cicero it occurs, with modifications, 28 times; in Livy 7 times. We may have (1) *tantum abest ut . . . ut*, or (2) *ut etiam* in the last clause, or (3) *ut contra*, or (4), only once, *ut vix*, or (5), instead of this second *ut*, (a) the indicative with *etiam*, or (b) with *vix*. Other modifications, extremely rare, are given.

2. The genitive of *neuter*. The form *neutrius* is archaic, extremely rare, and to be excluded from school grammars, although the 26th edition of Ellendt-Seyffert says 'und *ar*, *ur*, *us* sind *neutrius*'.

39. In Ciceronis epistulas ad M. Brutum. V. d. Vliet, Haarlem. Critical notes on I 12, 15, 16, 17.

40. Zu Ciceros rede pro Murena. Roscher.

41. (daminum) Epidaminus Epidaminensis. Hasper, Dresden. The name Epidamus, with its derivatives, like *damnum*, goes back to a form having *i* between *m* and *n*. This *i* can be restored in all passages in Plautus where it has dropped out, excepting in vv. 263 and 267 of the Menaech., where there is a pun on Epidamus and *damnum*.

42. Emendationes Vergilianae. Baehrens. These emendations cover Book II. See Jahrbücher, 1884, pp. 391-412.

(31). Zu Sallustius. A critical note on Jug. 70, 2. *Clarum* is a better reading than *carum*, though the phrase *carus acceptusque* is common enough.

43. *A* and *ab* before consonants. Meusel, Berlin. The result of the statistics here given is that before *b*, *v*, *m*, *f*, *p* the use of *a* was the rule; before *d*, *t*, *l*, *n*, *r*, *s*, in earlier times *ab* was the commoner, and in classic times was still preferred by many writers; that before *g* and *q*, *c* and *t* the form *a* was common, though *ab* occurs, rarely, before *g* and *q*, less rarely before *c* and *t*.

44. Zu Tacitus Annalen. Critical notes (3) by F. Walter, München.

45. Ein falscher Hyginus. Otto Rossbach, Rom.

46. Die unvollständigkeit des zweiten buches des Propertius und ihre entstehung. A. Otto. This is against the view of Birt (Rh. Mus. XXXVIII 197) that what remains to us of the second book of Propertius are the selections of some excerptor. Rather was it the case that in the original MS the pages containing the seventh and following poems of Book II were destroyed and, with them, those that indicated where the next book began. See Berl. phil. Wochenschrift, 1885, column 487.

47. Zu kritik des rhetors Seneca. A. Otto. Critical notes on the *Suasoriae* and *Controversiae*.

W. E. WATERS.

EDW. B. CLAPP.

GERMANIA. Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde. Herausgegeben von Karl Bartsch. Wien, 1885-6.

Ernst Kraus, "Über Heinrich von Freiberg." Three poems, supposed to have been written by Heinrich v. Freiberg, have come to us: A continuation of Gottfried's unfinished Tristan (T), the expedition of John of Michelsberg (M), and the poem of the Holy Cross (C). Their first editor, v. d. Hagen,

unhesitatingly assigned them to the same writer, while W. Grimm, upon a comparison of T with M, doubted this at the time (*Zur Geschichte des Reims*, p. 19). Goedeke, in his *Grundriss*, calls attention to the great contrast in the merit of the three poems. Bechstein agrees with v. d. Hagen, and ascribes the difference in rhyme and style to the difference in the time of composition, taking M and C to be the earliest efforts of the poet. This opinion Kraus contests, and adopts in the main the view first started by W. Grimm, that T and M had different authors. He further holds that the writers of T and C were one and the same, and proceeds to establish his theory by pointing out in detail the marks of similarity in rhyme, dialect, and vocabulary in the two poems. The description of knightly pageants, the style, and, above all, the poverty of context, stamps M as emanating from an author far inferior to the writer of T, who must always be ranked as one of the best among the later mediaeval poets.

"Der älteste Tristrantdruck" is the subject of a paper by F. Pfaff, in which he gives a full account of the now oldest Tristrant prose edition. It was found in the Royal Library at Berlin, and bears the date of 1484, fourteen years older than the one heretofore considered as the *editio princeps*. This makes the number of Tristrant prose editions 18. Pfaff compares the reading of this edition with Eilhart's poem, and concludes that it does not represent the oldest prose version—which must have been lost—and that its value for Eilhart criticism and text emendation is not as great as first was expected. In the course of his discussion, Franz Lichtenstein, the editor of "Eilhart," comes in for a little sharp mentioning, in consequence of the latter's criticism of Pfaff's edition of the prose Tristrant.

O. Brenner, "Zum Speculum Regale," defends the resolution of abbreviations in his edition of the *Konungsskuggsjá*. While granting that in the case of small manuscripts, isolated in language or contents, especially old fragments and poetic monuments, a diplomatic copy is not only recommendable but obligatory, Brenner contends that, as regards long prose texts, clear in language, not very rich in abbreviations, and handed down in numerous manuscripts, the obscurity of the print, the danger of overlooking trifles in proofreading, the trouble to the compositor, and the expense of printing do not correspond to the imagined advantages of a diplomatic edition.

Hans Herzog has a minor paper on *Memento Mori*, which he thinks was written down in the Benedictine Abbey of Muri. The name in the last line (*daz machot allein Noker*) he thinks is identical with the Notker who, together with a certain Heinrich, is mentioned as having written most of the books in the monastery. According to Scherer (Z. f. d. A. 24, 430), he is not the same as Notker Teutonicus of St. Gaul.

Ludwig Tobler offers a new explanation of the word *kuniorwidi* in the Merseburger Spruch. Taking *kunio* in its original meaning, "race," he refers to Plutarch's account of the defeat of the Cimbri at Vercelli (*Marius*, chap. XXVII), where it is said that the Cimbri were bound together by great chains (*μακραις ἀλίσσοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους συνεχόμενοι*). From meaning a chain binding together members of a family in battle, the word then came to mean, when this custom became obsolete, a great chain in general.

Colmar Schumann gives a number of notes on doubtful passages in the Heliand. In l. 2 he thinks *wordgodes* is taken from l. 7, as a gloss to *reckean* that *girdni*. The other lines commented on are 25, 50, 94, 217, 256, 297, 447, 546-47, 605, 880, 955, 984, 1354, 1396, 1553, 1738, 2188, 2410, 2685-90, 2888, 3065, 3161, 3227, 3235, 3372, 3451, 3696-3700, 4004, 4086, 4329, 4416, 4704, 4899, 5113, 5158, 5426, 5497, 5508, 5714, 5890, 5920.

To Bartsch's notes on Arnold's *Juliane* (cf. *Germania*, 28, 257 ff.), R. Sprenger adds a few others. In ll. 585 ff., for example, instead of *die dā schuzzen die guote*, etc., he would read *die dā schuzzen die gluote*.

"Zum Kürenberger." By Hermann Neubourg. The author gives a few more parallels between the Kürenberger strophe and the Nibelungen strophe, in addition to those already discovered by Pfeiffer, Bartsch, Thausing, and H. Fischer, and cites a few instances of foreign influence in the Kürenberger. In strophe 2 (*wes manest du mich leide*) he thinks the person addressed is a lady, and not, as hitherto supposed, a knight, for which several reasons are adduced. The question whether strophe 8, 9 (*jō stuont ich nechtint spāte*) should be struck out is answered in the negative. As to the character of the Kürenberger, Neubourg takes exception to certain statements by Scherer, who, he thinks, has painted the poet too black.

"Bruchstück aus Wolframs *Parzival*." To the list of *Parzival* MSS contained in Lachmann's edition, Franz Pfeiffer's *Quellenmaterial*, and Goedeke's *Grundriss*, K. A. Barack adds a fragment belonging to the public library of Colmar. It corresponds to Lachmann, 478, 11-482, 28, and 492, 1-496, 15. The handwriting, which is neat and elegant, dates from the thirteenth century. The text commonly corresponds to G, not seldom also to D.

"Aus den Predigten Georgs von Giengen." In the library of the Foundation of Premonstrants at Geras, in Lower Austria, C. M. Blaas found two codices containing a hitherto unknown collection of sermons, whose author he identifies with the university teacher in Vienna, Georg Tudel von Giengen. He publishes the most important of his sermons, especially those pertaining to costumes, social life, superstition, and customs.

Hermann Fischer continues his "Kleine Mittheilungen," containing a "Fragment of a Swabian Medical Book," which, according to the handwriting, dates from the fifteenth century and belongs to the Swabian-Alemannic district, most likely to Würtemberg; a "Fragment of the *Passional*," and a "Fragment of Barlaam and Josaphat," of the same date and dialect; and "Two Fragments of the Lives of the Fathers," of the fourteenth century and of a Middle German or M. H. G. dialect. These fragments are all taken from MSS in the Royal Public Library of Stuttgart.

K. A. Barack publishes a "Bruchstück aus Rudolfs von Ems *Wilhelm von Orlens*," dating from the fourteenth century; and Oskar Böhme discusses a number of M. H. G. words not found in Lexer's Dictionary, or only imperfectly defined.

Adalbert Jeitteles publishes a "Bruchstück aus Rudolfs *Weltchronik*," and K. Bartsch a "Brückstück eines deutschen *Cato*." Felix Liebrecht gives a

favorable review of "Sagor ock Åsventyr upptecknade i Skåne af Eva Wigström, Stockholm, 1884."

No. 2 opens with an article by Gustav Ehrismann on the Relation of the MSS of the Renner of Hugo von Trimberg, and R. Sprenger follows with a series of notes on the Kindheit Jesu by Konrad von Fussebrunnen.

Ernst Kraus publishes a fragment of the Schwabenspiegel, discovered June, 1883, in a MS of the Bohemian Museum, dating from the second half of the fifteenth century.

Hermann Fischer, Anton Birlinger, and Theodor Gelbe publish fragments of Rudolf's Weltchronik.

Ferdinand Holthausen publishes a Latin sermon against dancing, by Johannes Herolt, of the year 1492, and K. Bartsch a German sermon on the same subject, taken from a MS in the library of Erfurt, dating from the fifteenth century.

J. J. Crane publishes two Latin folk-tales of the Middle Ages. These are variants of Grimm's Märchen, "Das Wasser des Lebens" and "Die drei Brüder."

Renward Brandstetter publishes "The Luzern Stage-Directions" for the years 1545, 1560; those for 1583 and 1597 follow in No. 3.

Gustav Rossert publishes two German songs from the time of the Schmalkaldic War, and A. Bernoulli publishes rhymed maxims found on the first leaves of a MS containing a chronicle of Colmar to the year 1425.

In Miscellen, Felix Liebrecht prints a corrected text of the Icelandic ballad Kistuðans, already published in Germania XXIX, and accompanies it with a German translation; and Franz Happe publishes a number of letters by Meusebach to Cl. A. Schlüter, written between 1820 and 1823; others written between 1824 and 1843 follow in No. 3.

No. 3 opens with a series of notes by Fedor Bech on Kinzel's new edition of Lamprecht's Alexander. Bech takes exception to several of Kinzel's textual emendations and comments on a number of passages.

Fr. Losch gives facsimiles of the Runic Alphabets of Berne, and accompanies the same with detailed remarks on the various characters. Though not written by an Anglo-Saxon, he thinks these runes are of an Anglo-Saxon-Northumbrian origin. Among the characters he finds some that are specifically Gothic. Hermann Hagen adds a few remarks on the age, origin, and contents of the MS. He refers it to the ninth or tenth century. The character of the writing points to Scotland or Ireland, a fact of no small importance for the runes in question.

Paul Walther furnishes an interesting paper on the name Germanus, which he identifies with Latin *germanus*. In another little paper he thinks that in the "spruch" *Selbwahsen kint*, etc., which has given commentators so much trouble, Walther v. d. Vogelweide addresses wayward youth in general, and no particular individual.

Ignaz Peters has a minor paper, "Die Zahl der Blätter des Codex Argenteus," and J. Trötscher sends emendations "Zum M. H. D. Wörterbuch."

J. Baechtold publishes another Zürich fragment of Parzival (cf. Germania, XXIX 71), corresponding to Lachmann, 10, 8-28, 24; and A. Jeitteles publishes a song on the William Tell-Gessler story.

Felix Liebrecht gives a review of "ΚΡΥΤΑΙΑ. Recueil de documents pour servir à l'étude des traditions populaires. Vols. I, II. Heilbronn, Henninger frères, éditeurs, 1883, 1884." In the Miscellany he gives a very interesting account of the origin and development of the Northern Museum (Nordiska Museet), founded by Arthur Hazelius in Stockholm. Inspired from early youth with an intense patriotism, Hazelius was grieved to see how fast all peculiarities of manners, costumes, etc., were disappearing, and determined to buy up old garments, etc., and preserve them from destruction. The private collection begun in this way soon swelled to great proportions, and has led to imitations in Finland, Denmark, and Norway. In 1880 Hazelius presented his museum to the Swedish nation.

No. 4 opens with an article by K. v. Bahder on "Lamprecht's Alexanderlied and its Home." Kinzel incorrectly refers the Strassburg MS to the southern part of Middle Franconia. Bahder thinks with W. Grimm that it belongs to the Middle Rhine, perhaps a little south of the Lower Main. The dialect of the "Ueberarbeitung" also belongs to the east side of the Rhine. It adjoins the Hessian dialect, and is perhaps to be localized on the Thuringian border north of Rhön. Kinzel's supposition that Lamprecht made use of the old Kaiserchronik, that his Alexander was used by the priest Konrad, and that Lamprecht, therefore, must have written in Bavaria, where the two poems arose, is not probable. Lamprecht used both the Kaiserchronik and Roland. This need not have been done in Bavaria, as the Strassburg MS of the Roland shows how soon the poem reached the Rhine. Alexander has more resemblances to another Bavarian poem, König Rother. K. v. Bahder contributes another short paper, "Zu Wernher vom Niederrhein und dem wilden Mann," and a few verbal explanations. The words commented on are: *ingiriuno* (in *ingriuno*) in Otfried, *sich marawen* and *swēd* in Notker, and the verb *jehen*, for which he thinks there is a Middle German variant *jīhen*.

Al. Reifferscheid contributes a short treatise by Albert Hoefer on "Love as a subject of popular German poetry"; and the remaining part of the number consists of a bibliographical list of books that appeared in the field of Germanic philology during the year 1884.

#### Heft 1.

1886-87.

Beiträge zur Kenntniss der niederdeutschen Mystik, by F. Jostes. The value of the works of the mystics belonging to the little circle that clustered round Ruysbroeck at Groendael has long been recognized by the historian and the student of literature, and the Maatschappij of Flemish bibliophiles may be said to have opened up one of the most important mines of information on the subject when they published, under the editorship of the late Prof. David of Louvain, the first complete edition of Ruysbroeck's works. Merit of a similar

kind, though in a less degree, attaches to Van Otterloo's treatise, "Johannes Ruysbroeck, een bijdrage tot de kennis van den ontwikkelingsgang der mystiek," which excels the works of Engelhardt and Böhringer on the same subject. There seems to be, then, no lack of treatises already written concerning Ruysbroeck and the mystics in the Netherlands, yet the present addition to the number will not be unwelcome to those who are familiar with the earlier works and who know how much is still to be done to clear up the relation of Ruysbroeck to his predecessors, to determine his influence upon his contemporaries and successors, and the development of mysticism in the Netherlands. With seemingly abundant, though widely scattered material, the literature pertinent to this question has not been sufficiently gathered to allow of systematic research. In conclusion, Jostes prints part of two important MSS heretofore unpublished.

L. Fulda contributes an article, "Noch einmal Zelt und Harnisch im ersten und zweiten Buche des Parzival," in which he suggests an explanation of the difficulties caused by the confusion of the terms *palas* and *harnas* in the first two books of the epic. The places referred to are 27, 13-28, 6; 52, 17-53, 11; 54, 11-16; 58, 9-17; 61, 8-15; 64, 13-18; 70, 13-21. This is an old and notable controversy. Isenhart has given away a valuable possession for the sake of Belacane. Was it the *harnas* or *palas*? (27, 15-20, Lachmann):

er gap durh mich s̄in harnas  
enwec, daz als ein palas  
dort st̄et (daz ist ein hōch gezelt:  
daz brāhten Schotten ūf diz velt.)  
dō daz der helt āne wart,  
s̄in līp dō wēnic wart gespart.

Lachmann places the words *daz ist* to *velt* in parenthesis, and takes *harnas*, so to speak, as pars pro toto (the armor lying in the tent). Haupt explains in a similar manner, and both agree that the passage is by no means clear. San Marte (Germ. II 85) puts the parenthesis before *daz als*, and supposes the enclosed sentence to be an incidental expression which suddenly interrupts the course of the story. Bartsch first believed that Wolfram, in translating here, had mistaken the Old French *helberg* (= *Herberge*, *Hütte*, *Zelt*) for the much more frequently occurring *halberg*, which view, controverted by Paul (Beiträge, II 71), he abandoned in his second edition of Parzival, accepting instead the explanation of San Marte. Lately Bötticher and Zacher have again revived the opinion long ago discarded by Bartsch (Ztschr. f. d. Phil. XIII 4). After refuting in detail the arguments brought forward in support of their views, Fulda asks the question whether Isenhart could not have given away both *armor* and *tent*, and wonders why no one has thought this third case possible, which would remove all difficulties and protect a great poet from the accusation of having been, even if but once in his life, a thoughtless translator. Fulda strikes out Lachmann's parenthesis, places after *enwec* a semi-colon, and translates: "Er gab um meinwilnen seine Rüstung fort; was als ein Palast dort steht, das ist ein geräumiges Zelt, welches Schotten auf dies Feld brachten. Als (auch) dessen der Held sich entäussert hatte, da schonte er sein Leben nicht mehr."

Reinhold Köhler, "Zu Dietrich's von Gleze Gedicht 'der Borte,'" in noting the coincidence between the story in this poem, the antique of Kephalos and Prokris, as told by Antoninus Liberalis (*Metamorphoses*, chap. 41), Hyginus (*Fabula* 189), Ovid (*Metamorphoses*, VII 682), and the story in Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* of the judge Anselmo and his wife Argia, calls attention to a striking similarity which they all bear to the "Märchen" in the *Histoire de la dame des Arabes Jasmin* in the *Contes Arabes modernes*, *recueillis et traduits par G. Spitta-Bey* (Leide, Paris, 1883). Whether this Arabian märchen, like the Italian and the Old German, found its germs in the Greek story, or whether not all be "the glittering star-dust, the fragments of the earlier constellations of Oriental fancy," will be indeed difficult to settle.

F. M. Böhme furnishes "Nachträge zum altdeutschen Liederbuch." These Nachträge, consisting of the folksongs "Die Frau von Weissenburg" (with the original melody), *der Mutter Warnung*, and *der Dollinger*, of which different versions have already found a place in his *Liederbuch*, are an additional evidence of the unceasing and steady work that is being accomplished by the author of the foremost publication on the field of the *Volkslieder* of Germany, Franz M. Böhme.

Gustav Ehrismann, "Zu Eilhart's Tristrant 1183," proposes an explanation of the proper name *Jemsetir* in the Tristrant. By a change of the initial we get the Old French *Semsetir* = *sems* (*sens*) *tiere* (*tere, terre*), *sine terra*.

"Mittheilungen aus der Münchner Kön. Bibliothek" is the subject of a paper by F. Keinz and K. Bartsch, in which they describe and print a number of fragments found in the Munich library. These consist of fragments from a poetical version of the *Genesis* and *Exodus*, probably written towards the end of the twelfth century by a Middle German poet, a legend of St. Patrick, fragments from *Veldeke's Eneide*, *Aue's Arm. Heinrich*, *Reinbot's Georg*, *Stoffel's Gauriel*, *Konrad's Goldner Schmiede*, and a collection of Low German fables. Theo. v. Grienberger adds to these some *Salzburg* fragments (*Konrad v. Heimesfurt Mariae Himmelfahrt* and *Aus dem Buch der Märtyrer*) of the first half of the fifteenth century.

K. v. Bahder supplies a fable, still found among the southern Slavonic people, which will throw light on the question asked in one of Sper vogel's *Sprüche* (Mf. 26, 34): "Weister wie der igel sprach? Vil guot ist eigen gemach." This fable, to which the poet evidently refers, must have been lost in Germany at an early time, since not a trace of it is found in any of the mediaeval collections. In addition Bahder prints a Middle German "Gereimte Beichte" of the 12th century, from a codex in Upsala, and a Low German "Canticum Rustardini" from a paper MS (fifteenth century) in the same library. In an article, "Des Hundes nöt," Bahder controverts the opinion of Voigt, who, in his edition *Isengrimus* (p. xci), pronounces the *Thierepen* creations of the French mind and in their elements the offshoot of the humor and satire of French monks. Bahder agrees with Gustav Meyer's expression in the latter's essays (p. 225), "Thiermärchen zu ersinnen darf man dem menschlichen Geiste unter allen Himmelsstrichen zutrauen," and adduces examples of Slavonic forms of the Märchen of *Isengrimus*. The M. H. G. poem, "Des Hundés nöt," is shown to go directly back to a German fable.

F. Holthausen conclusively proves the "Luzerner Fastnachtsspiel" (published in *Zeitschr. f. d. Philol.* Vol. 17, p. 347) a translation of Nicolas de la Chesnaye's Old French *moralité*, "La condamnation de bancquet," and Chr. Kolb sends a fragment from the *Aventiure Crône* of Heinrich von dem Türlin, which K. found as part of a cover round a parchment MS in the Schwäbisch-Hall city library. Otto Böckel contributes a variant of the German *Leonorensage*, and F. Losch points out some stupid, perhaps intentional mistakes made by the writer of the "Berner Runenalphabete" (Run. Cod. Bern. 207, fol. 264 b). Cf. *Germania* 1885, Heft 3.

C. Marold, in a minor paper, "Zu Otfrid," believes the title, "Liber evangeliorum," used by Otfrid for his work, to be borrowed by the latter from Juvencus, who, according to nearly all MSS, employed it for his *Historia evangelica*. Juvencus figures among the poets mentioned by Otfrid in the dedication to Liutbert, and belonged to the best known writers of that time.

A short communication, "Zum Rolandsliede" (ed. Bartsch), from F. Holthausen, has a few new emendations, and "Das Verhältniss der Texte von Lamprecht's Alexander" is discussed by Otto Behagel, who holds the Basle text to stand independent of the Vorau and Strassburg versions.

Carl Bartsch prints the first page of the Iwein MS (a) of Heidelberg, which hitherto could scarcely be deciphered any more. With the aid of Dr. Zange-meister and sulphide of ammonium he managed to spell out a few words in each verse.

Under the head of Literature, Dr. Bartsch speaks most favorably of O. von Heinemann's Catalogue of the MSS in the celebrated Ducal Library at Wolfenbüttel (1884), and the Miscellany contains "Handschriftliches aus Luzern," i. e. a few specimens from a Low German MS of the fifteenth century.

C. F. RADDATZ.

## BRIEF MENTION.

Messrs. STRONG and PEARSON's *Juvenal* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1887), being intended for the mixed classes in modern English colleges, has been expurgated for safe perusal. The sixth satire has been omitted bodily, as well it might, if an expurgating editor has no more judgment than the gentleman who failed to excise v. 73. Satires II and IX share the banishment of VI, and the knife has been carefully used on the rest. What Messrs. Strong and Pearson had to avoid in a college edition they have fairly succeeded in avoiding. The student will not have to encounter the overwhelming erudition of Mayor, nor the leisurely chattiness of Lewis, nor the false point-making of Simcox. Each satire is preceded by a reduction, as it might be called rather than a summary, the usefulness of which the present writer would be the last to dispute, and these are all well done. The notes are boiled down to the minimum and sometimes below the minimum, and the grammatical and stylistic observations are decidedly fitful. Anything that happens to have interested the editors in any recent publication is clapped in, and there is no systematic record of grammatical and rhetorical usage, such as would aid the student in forming an image of Juvenal's style. Nothing could be more important for measuring Juvenal than the comparison with Horace, Persius, Petronius, and Martial, not only for the things said, but for the way in which the things are said; but the limits are so narrowly drawn as to make this impossible. The spelling is inconsistent, *coena* here and *cena* there, and it must be confessed that *strigil* printed as a Latin word (on 3, 263) is a rasping mistake, which might have been forgiven before the publication of Frischlin's famous *Strigilis grammatica*, in 1584, but not since. The citations are sometimes careless. In references to Müller's Handbuch the volume is not given, nor the page, nor the author of the article, except once, and then falsely. So in the note on 4, 105 'Brugman in Müller's Hdbch.' should be Schmalz in Müller's Handbuch, II 270. Of the Greek syntax of the editors the note on 7, 104 does not make a favorable impression, for why we should expect the participle with *dv* for *legenti* is not discernible, nor does it speak well for their Latin feeling when they class *leto dedit* (10, 119) with Vergil, Aen. 5, 451: *it clamor caelo*. In fact, the whither dative in Latin poetry is an extension of the personal, and *leto dedit* enables us to understand *it caelo*, and not the other way. See my note on Pindar, O 2, 90, and add to the Greek examples there 167 and Plat. Rpb. 8, 566 c: *θαύμω διδοται*. Sometimes the hesitation is remarkable. There can be no doubt about *lassata viris* (6, 130); why should there be any about 1, 13: *assiduo lectore*? If *alius* requires a note (1, 10), surely *illum* requires a note (10, 108). 'Octonos . . . Idibus' (quoted 10, 116) is a misprint that corrects itself; but by what ill luck did the statement that 'M.' Acilius Glabrio was consul with Trajan in A. D. 44' get into the notes on 4, 94?

The introduction is well written and will commend itself to the admirers of the rhetorical poet, who has never lacked admirers in England, although, according to Mr. Pearson, he has his true spiritual congeners in Americans.

In the list of authorities Weidner figures in the front rank, a tardy satisfaction to a much slighted commentator, whose wails about neglect have evoked no sympathetic echoes in Germany, and we venture to say that the editors enjoy a like insular solitude in their high estimate of Doetsch's 'Juvenal, ein Sittenrichter seiner Zeit.' The index is quite inadequate.

If Messrs. Pearson and Strong have for the most part limited their notes on Juvenal to the 'irreducible minimum,' Prof. G. G. RAMSAY has allowed himself ample room for genial and discursive comment on *Selections from Tibullus and Propertius* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1887). This he has done in accordance with his experience 'that the surest way to interest students in the classics, even in their grammatical difficulties, is to make them feel how rich and varied a field of human interest they present.' In the pursuit of this interest, however, the commentator seems to allow himself far too much sweep, and the pages upon pages of extracts from an earlier Professor Ramsay's Tibullus are out of all proportion to the character of the present edition, and in any case should have been revised and brought down to date. In the commentary on Propertius, while Professor Ramsay makes a handsome acknowledgment of the merits of Professor Postgate's edition, he has the courage to differ with him at more than one important point, and, in fact, exhibits throughout a Scottish sturdiness which we must respect. Indeed, the Scottish flavor of the whole book is in delightful contrast to the so-called scholarly reserve so much in vogue, and cannot fail to heighten the pleasure with which it will be read by the lads, and especially by the lasses, whom the professor has evidently had in his eye. We like to see *cista* (Tib. 1, 7, 48) translated by 'kist,' and *depositam* (Tib. 2, 5, 8) by 'put past.' There is a certain 'pawkiness' also in the note on Prop. 3, 4, 17: 'It is an interesting and instructive circumstance that the ancient Southron was shocked because the Celt wore trousers, while the modern Southron affects to be no less shocked because he dispenses with them. The latter probably forgets that the kilt was a Roman military dress, worn by the Caesars: see the famous statue of Augustus in the Braccio Nuovo.' So much for the carping Sassenach. The treatment of grammatical phenomena is much more penetrating than what we find in Pearson and Strong's Juvenal, as, for instance, in the discussion of the so-called dative for *ad* and *acc.*; cf. Tib. 1, 1, 5: *vitae traducere* with 2, 5, 44: *caelo miserit*, though it would have been better to speak of 'personal dative' than of 'trajective force'. But, unfortunately, this commendation cannot be made uniform. So Professor Ramsay spoils a good note on Prop. 1, 8, 24 by a poor one on 1, 17, 6, and it is rather strange that the author of a work on Latin Prose Composition should not have made clear to himself once for all the difference between the relative interrogative *quin* and the relative *quominus*, and should have followed Postgate blind-fold on Prop. 1, 8, 22. In his note on Prop. 1, 22, 4: 'Italiae duris funera temporibus,' he says, 'Italiae, doubtless to be constructed both with *funera* and *temporibus*.' In spite of the Scottish caution which such a note suggests, and in spite

of the reinforcement of this procedure by the well-known example of Professor Campbell, we venture to say 'Doubtless not.' No word can have more than one regimen, although the echo of a word may haunt another element of the sentence. If we read *patriae sepulcra* we must construe *Italiae funera*. On Prop. 2, 13, 27 we find the inveterate superstition that the fut. implies a softened, courteous imperative. The note on *equidem* with the third person (Prop. 2, 31, 5) should have had a reference to Ribbeck, and on Prop. 3, 8, 17 some use should have been made of Jahn's overwhelming note on Pers. 4, 19. Prop. 3, 2, 8, *si* with ind. is the regular construction after *miror*, as *ei* with ind. after *θαυμάζω*. Prop. 3, 2, 21, the reference should be, not to Pind. P. 2, but to P. 6, 10. Other trifles it is not worth while to notice. It is a mere slip that in Prop. 1, 17, 3 the editor comments on *omnia et* and puts Paley's conj. *omine et* into the text, but it is a graver fault to waste space by repeating notes, which always savors of undigested work; comp. note on Tib. 1, 3, 34 with note on 1, 1, 20; the note on Tib. 1, 3, 37 with the note on 1, 1, 51.

Herr ROBERT SCHNEIDER of Halberstadt has edited the *Bellum Grammaticale* of JOHANN SPANGENBERG (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1887), a schoolmaster's trifle, which amused schoolmasters three hundred years ago and may amuse schoolmasters three hundred years hence. Some of the details of the war between the noun and the verb are very ingenious, such as the fate of the imperatives *Dice*, *Duce*, *Face* and *Fere* 'quibus ignominiae causa posteriores vestium partes praecidi iussit rex Poeta' (evidently suggested by 2 Sam. 10, 4), and there are curious side-lights thrown every now and then on the state of grammatical studies in the period of the Reformation. The editor seems to have done little beyond the correction of the spelling, which was hardly necessary for the only class of readers that will care to look into the little book.

Dr. B. SCHRADER's admirable work, *Sprachvergleichung und Un geschichte*, was sent to the most eminent authority in America for review as soon as it reached this Journal, but many engagements and impaired health have retarded for years the hoped-for notice. Meantime we would call attention to the *Prob vorlesung* of Dr. Schrader at the University of Jena, *Ueber den Gedanken einer Kulturgeschichte der Indogermanen auf sprachwissenschaftlicher Grundlage* (Jena, Hermann Costenoble, 1887), in which he has sketched with a firm hand and in bright colors the outlines of the province in which he has worked so successfully.

A Latin Grammar that fits itself so closely to the French idiom as M. LOUIS HAVET's *Abriége de Grammaire Latine* (Paris, Hachette, 1886) does not fall within our criticism. Still practical teachers will find valuable hints here and there, and the more scientific student will detect what Bréal happily calls 'the latent linguistics' of the little volume.

In the Library of Anglo-Saxon Poetry, Ginn & Co. will publish this summer Zupitza's *Elene*, edited, by permission of Prof. Zupitza, by Prof. Henry Johnson, Ph. D. (Berlin), of Bowdoin College.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

Goodell (T. D.) *The Greek in English*. New York, *H. Holt & Co.*, 1886. D. cl. 75 cts.

Hale (W. Gardner). *The Art of Reading Latin; how to teach it*. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1887. c. 74 pp. D. paper. 30 cts.

### BRITISH.

Antoninus. *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius*. Trans. from the Greek by Jeremy Collier. Revised, with Introduction and Notes, by Alice Zimmern. (Camelot Classics.) Post 8vo, 236 pp. *W. Scott.* 1s.

Avianus. *The Fables of Avianus*. Edit., with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Commentary, Excursus, and Index, by Robinson Ellis. 8vo, 182 pp. *Frowde.* 8s. 6d.

Best (K. T.) *An Etymological Manual*. For the use of schools and colleges. Containing more than 9000 derivates from Latin and Greek. New and revised ed. 12mo, 180 pp. *Stanford.* 3s.

Caesar. Books 1-4, Extracts from. Translated into English for re-translation, by R. C. Macnaghten and H. N. Macnaghten. 16mo, 65 pp. *Rivingtons.* 6d.

— *De Bello Gallico Commentarii*. After the German of Kraner-Dittenberger. By Rev. John Bond and A. S. Walpole. (Classical Series.) 12mo, 490 pp. *Macmillan.* 6s.

— *De Bello Civili*. (Oxford Pocket Classics.) 18mo, 382 pp. *Parker.* 1s. 6d.

— *Commentaries*. Books 1 to 3. For use of junior classes. By George Long. (Grammar School Classics.) 12mo. *Whittaker.* red. 1s. 6d.

— *The Gallic War*. Book 3. With Notes, Vocabulary, and Map. (Rivingtons' Annotated Latin Texts.) 16mo, 60 pp. *Rivingtons.* 1s.

— *The Gallic War*. Book 4. With Notes, Vocabulary, and Map. (Rivingtons' Annotated Latin Texts.) 16mo, 68 pp. *Rivingtons.* 1s.

Herodotus. VIII 1-90 (Artemisium and Salamis). With Introduction and Notes, by E. S. Shuckburgh. (Pitt Press Series.) 12mo, 190 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse.* 3s. 6d.

— *The Ionian Revolt*. Extracted from Herodotus, with Introduction and Notes, by Rev. E. D. Stone. 12mo, 50 pp. *Eton, Drake, Simpkin.* 2s.

Homer's *Odyssey*. Done into English verse by W. Morris. New ed. 2 vols. Vol. 1, 4to, bds., 226 pp. *Reeves & Turner.* 12s.

Jerram (C. S.) *Anglice Reddenda; or, Extracts for Unseen Translation for the use of Middle and Higher Forms.* 2d series. 12mo, 210 pp. *Frowde.* 3s.

Livy. Books 5, 6 and 7. With Introduction and Notes by A. R. Cluer. 2d ed., revised by P. E. Matheson. 12mo. *Frowde.* 5s.

Ovid. *Metamorphoses.* Book 13. Literally translated. 12mo, sd., 38 pp. *Cornish.* 1s. 6d.

— Ovidii (P.) *Nasonis Epistolarum ex Ponto Liber Primus.* With Introduction and Notes by Charles Haines Keene. Post 8vo, 96 pp. *Bell & Son.* 3s.

— Selections from. Ed., with Notes and Vocabulary, by H. R. Healey and J. Arnold Turner. New ed. 16mo, 180 pp. *Rivingtons.* 1s. 6d.

Plautus. T. Macci *Plauti Captivi.* With Introduction and Notes by W. M. Lindsay. Part 1. Introduction and Text. Part 2. Notes. 1 vol. 12mo. *Frowde.* 2s. 6d.

Sappho. *Memoir, Text, Selected Renderings, and a Literal Translation,* by Henry Thornton Wharton. 2d ed. 12mo, parchment, 222 pp. *Stott.* 7s. 6d.

Stedman (A. M. M.) *Miscellaneous Latin Exercises.* 12mo, 102 pp. *Bell & Sons.* 1s. 6d.

Xenophon's *Cyropaedia.* Books 1 and 2. By H. A. Holden. With Introduction and Notes. Part 1. Introduction and Text. Part 2. Notes, Critical, Appendix and Indices. (Pitt Press Series.) 2 vols. 12mo. *Cambridge Warehouse.* 6s.

#### FRENCH.

Basset (René). *Manuel de la langue kabyle (dialecte Zouaoua).* Grammaire, bibliographie, chrestomathie et lexique. In-12. *Maison neuve.* Cart., 6 fr. 50.

Chaignet (A. Ed.) *Essais de métrique grecque. Le vers iambique, précédé d'une introduction sur les principes généraux de la métrique grecque.* In-8. *Vieweg.* 6 fr.

Regnier (Ad.) *De la latinité des sermons de saint Augustin.* In-8. *Hachette.* 5 fr.

Virey (Ph.) *Étude sur le papyrus Prisse. Le Livre de Kaqimna et les Leçons de Ptah-Hotep.* Gr. in-8. *Vieweg.* 8 fr.

#### GERMAN.

Abel (Carl). *Einleitung in e. ägyptisch-semitisch-indoeuropäisches Wurzelwörterbuch.* 5 Hft., gr. 8 (Index S. 49-120). Leipzig, *Friedrich.* à m. 20.

Ascoli (G. I.) *Sprachwissenschaftliche Briefe.* Autoris. Übersetzg. v. Bruno Güterbock. gr. 8, xvi, 228 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel.* m. 4.

Autenrieth (Geo.) *Wörterbuch zu den homerischen Gedichten.* Für Schüler bearb. Mit vielen Holzschn. u. 2 Karten. 5 verb. Aufl., gr. 8, xviii, 364 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 3.

Avieni, Rufi Festi, carmina, rec. Alfr. Holder. gr. 8, lxv, 296 S. Innsbruck, *Wagner.* m. 10.

Axt (Prof.) *Zur Topographie v. Rhegion u. Messana.* gr. 4, 36 S. *Grimma Gensel.* m. 1.

Barthold (Th.) Kritisch-exegetische Untersuchungen zu d. Euripides Medea u. Hippolytus. gr. 4, 42 S. Hamburg, *Herold's Verl.* m. 2.50.

Belser (Dr.) Die attischen Strategen im V. Jahrh. [Aus "Korrespondenzbl. f. d. württ. Gelehrten- u. Realschulen."] gr. 8, 37 S. Tübingen, *Fues' Verl.*, 1886. m. —60.

— Dasselbe, noch einige Bemerkungen. [Aus "Korrespondenzbl. f. d. württ. Gelehrten- u. Realschulén."] gr. 8, 8 S. Ebd. m. —20.

Bethe (Erich). Quaestiones Diodoreae mythographae. Diss. gr. 8, 106 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. m. 2.40.

Blümner (Hugo). Technologie u. Terminologie der Gewerbe u. Künste bei Griechen u. Römern. 4 Bd. 2 Abth. Mit zahlreichen Abbildgn. gr. 8, xi u. S. 379—629. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 7.20 (cpl. m. 50.40.)

Breidt (Herm.) De Aurelio Prudentio Clemente Horatii imitatore. Diss. gr. 8, 52 S. Heidelberg, *C. Winter*. m. 1.60.

Buchwald (Ferd.) Quaestiones Silianae. gr. 8, 32 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. —80.

Buschē (Carl). Observationes criticae in Euripidis Troades. gr. 8, 48 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. —75.

Cornelii Nepotis vitae selectae. Praemissae sunt breviores narrationes. Scholarum in usum ed. Adb. Meingast. 8, 47 S. Wien, *Manz*. m. —60.

Curtius (Ernst). Griechische Geschichte. 1 Bd. Bis zum Beginne der Perserkriege. 6 verb. Aufl. gr. 8, vii, 701 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 8.

Delitzsch (Frdr.) Assyrisches Wörterbuch zur gesammten bisher veröffentlichten Keilschriftliteratur unter Berücksicht. zahlreicher unveröffentlichter Texte. (In ca. 10 Lfgn.) 1 Lfg., gr. 4, 168 autogr. S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* Subscr.-Pr. m. 31.50.

Dilthey (Carl). De epigrammatum graecorum syllogis quibusdam minoribus commentatio. hoch 4, 25 S. Göttingen, *Dietrich's Verl.* m. —80.

Dissertationes philologae Vindobonenses. Vol. 1. gr. 8, 348 S. Prag, *Tempsky*. Leipzig, *Freytag*. m. 7.

Eckstein (Fr. Aug.) Lateinischer u. griechischer Unterricht. Mit e. Vorwort v. W. Schrader. Hrsg. v. Heinr. Heyden. gr. 8, xiii, 501 S. Leipzig, *Fues*. m. 9.

Fischer (W.) Gegen den Homer-Kultus in unseren Schulen. gr. 8, 24 S. Leipzig, *Siegismund & Volkenberg*. m. —60; cart. m. —75.

Foerster (Rich.) De Apulei quae fertur physiognomia recensenda et emendanda. [Aus "Jahrbb. f. class. Philol., 15 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, S. 557—590. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 1.20.

Forchhammer (P. W.) Erklärung der Ilias u. s. w. Ein Beitrag zur Erledigg. der homer. Frage. 3 unveränd. (Titel-)Aufl., 4, xi, 163 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer* (1884), 1888. m. 10.

Franke (A. Otto). Die Sarvasāmīmata-Çikshā m. Commentar. Diss. gr. 8, xvi, 43 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*, 1886. m. 2.

Frey (Karl). Das Leben d. Perikles. gr. 4, 35 S. Bern. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.20.

Gasda (Aug.) Kritische Bemerkungen zu Themistios. Fortsetzung. 4, 20 S. Lauban. Leipzig, *Fock*. à m. —90.

Gasquy (Armand). De Fabio Planciade Fulgentio, Virgilii interprete. [Berliner Studien, 6 Bd., 1 Hft.] gr. 8, 44 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 1.60.

Geppert (Paul). *Zum Monumentum Ancyranum.* gr. 4, 18 S. Berlin, *Gaertner.* m. 1.

Gomperz (Thdr.) *Zu Heraklit's Lehre u. den Ueberresten seines Werkes.* [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 61 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 1.

Graeber (Gust.) *Einige Reste nebengeordneter Satzbildung in untergeordnetem Satzgefüge bei Thucydides u. Xenophon.* gr. 4, 20 S. Breklum, *Christl. Buchhandl.* m. 1.

Grimmelt (Bernh.) *De reipublicae Platonis compositione et unitate.* Diss. gr. 8, 102 S. Berlin, *W. Weber.* m. 1.20.

Haake (Alb.) *Die Gesellschaftslehre der Stoiker.* gr. 4, 22 S. Berlin *Calvary & Co.* m. 1.60.

Hartmann (Ludw. Mor.) *De exilio apud Romanos inde ab initio bellorum civilium usque ad Severi Alexandri principatum.* gr. 8, 63 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 1.20.

Hauler (Edm.) *Neue Bruchstücke zu Sallusts Historien.* [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 66 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 1.

Herodoti historiarum liber V et VI. Scholarum in usum ed. Alfr. Holder. 8, vii, 48 u. viii, 47 S. Prag, *Tempsky.* Leipzig, *Freytag.* à m. —40.

Hess (Geo.) *Curae Annaeanae.* Pars I. gr. 4, 26 S. Altona, *Schlüter.* m. —80.

Homer's Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. Karl Frdr. Ameis. 2 Bd., 3 Hft. Gesang XIX-XXI. Bearb. v. C. Hentze. 2 bericht. Aufl., gr. 8, 96 S. Leipzig, *Taubner.* m. 1.20.

— Dasselbe. Anhang. 3 Hft. Erläuterungen zu Gesang VII-IX v. C. Hentze. 2 umgearb. Aufl., gr. 8, 174 S. Ebd. m. 1.80.

Homeri Iliadis carmina, ed. Alois Rzach. Pars II, Carm. XIII-XXIV. 8, 375 S. Prag, *Tempsky.* Leipzig, *Freytag.* à m. 1.

— Odyssea, scholarum in usum ed. Paul. Cauer. Pars II, Carm. XIII-XXIV. 8, 228 S. Ebd. à m. 1.

— Odysseae epitome. In usum scholarum ed. Frc. Pauly. Ed. VI correctior, quam curavit Dr. Carol. Wottke. Pars I. Odysseae lib. I-XII. 8, xi, 149 S. Ebd. m. —70.

Illmann (Phpp.) *De Tibulli codicis Ambrosiani auctoritate.* Diss. gr. 8, 85 S. Halis Sax. 1886. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller.* m. 1.50.

Jahrbücher f. classische Philologie. Hrsg. v. Alfr. Fleckisen. 15 Suppl.-Bd., 3 Hft., gr. 8, iii u. S. 557-728. Leipzig, *Taubner.* m. 4. (15 Suppl.-Bd. cpl. m. 14.80.)

Joël (Karl). *Zur Erkenntniss der geistigen Entwicklung u. der schriftstellerischen Motive Platos.* gr. 8, 90 S. Berlin, *Gaertner.* m. 2.

Johansson (Karl Ferd.) *De derivatis verbis contractis linguae graecae quaestiones.* [Aus "Upsala Universitets Årsskrift."] gr. 8, iv, 218 S. Upsala, *Akadem. Buchhandl.*, 1886. m. 6.

Kaiser (Rud.) *De inscriptionum graecarum interpunctione.* gr. 8, 38 S. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.

Klinke (Geo.) *Quaestiones Aeschinea criticae.* gr. 8, 82 S. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.50.

Koch (Johs.) *Quaestionum de proverbiis apud Aeschylum, Sophoclem, Euripidem caput I.* Diss. gr. 8, 92 S. Königsberg, *Gräfe & Unser.* m. 1.50.

Kruse (H.) Üb. Interpolationen in Xenophons Hellenika. gr. 4, 30 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer.* m. 2.

Kühnau (Rich.) Rhythmus u. indische Metrik. gr. 8, 24 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* m. —80.

Lengnick (Bernh.) Der Bildungswert d. Lateinischen nach dem auf unseren Gymnasien herrschenden Betriebe. gr. 4, 27 S. Berlin, *Gaertner.* m. 1.

Lindner (B.) Das Kaushitaki Brähmaṇa. Hrsg. u. übers. I. Text. gr. 8, xii, 160 S. Jena, *Costenoble.* m. 10.

Longinus. *Διονυσίον ἡ Δογγίλον περὶ ἵψους.* De sublimitate libellus, in usum scholarum ed. Otto Jahn. a. MDCCCLXVII. Iterum ed. Joa. Vahlen. gr. 8, xii, 80 S. Bonn, *Marcus.* cart. m. 2.40.

Lysias, ausgewählte Reden. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. W. Kocks. 2 Bdchn. Ausg. A. Kommentar unterm Text. gr. 8, v u. S. 105—199. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes.* à m. 1.50. Ausg. B. Text u. Kommentar getrennt in 2 Hftn. iv u. S. 51—93 u. 53—105. à m. 1.50.

Magnus (Hugo). Studien zu Ovids Metamorphosen. gr. 4, 31 S. Berlin, *Gaertner.* m. 1.

Mayerhoefner (Ant.) Geschichtlich-topographische Studien üb. das alte Rom. Mit 1 Karte. gr. 8, iii, 115 S. München, *Lindauer.* m. 2.

Mekler (Geo.) Beiträge zur Bildung d. griechischen Verbums. I. Verba contracta m. langem Themenvocal. II. Die Flexion d. activen Plusquamperfects. Diss. gr. 8, 90 S. Dorpat, *Karow.* m. 1.50.

Meyer (Arth.) De compositione theogoniae Hesiodeae. Diss. gr. 8, 102 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller.* m. 2.

Nemesii Emeseni libri περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου versio latina. E libr. ms. nunc primum ed. et apparatu critico instruxit Carol. Holzinger. gr. 8, xxxvii, 175 S. Prag, *Tempsky.* Leipzig, *Freytag.* m. 6.

Platonis opera quae feruntur omnia. Ad codices denuo collatos ed. Mart. Schanz. (Kritische Ausg.) Vol. III, Fasc. 1. Sophista. gr. 8, ix, 92 S. Leipzig, *B. Tauchnitz.* m. 2.

Plutarchi de proverbiis Alexandrinorum libellus ineditus, rec. et praefatus est Otto Crusius. gr. 4, 34 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 2.80.

Quintiliani (M. Fabi) institutionis oratoriae liber X. Ed. Ferd. Meister. 8, xiii, 45 S. Prag, *Tempsky.* Leipzig, *Freytag.* m. —25.

— Dasselbe. Vol. II. Liber VII—XII. 8, v, 363 S. Ebd. m. 1.50 (cpl. m. 2.70).

Radloff (W.) Die Sprachen der nördlichen türkischen Stämme. 1 Abth. Proben der Volkslitteratur. Gesammelt u. übers. VI Thl. Der Dialect der Tarantschi. Lex.-8, viii, 272 S. St. Petersburg, 1886. Leipzig, *Voss' Sort.* m. 3.70 (1—6, m. 44.80).

Rahlfs (Alfr.) Des Gregorius Abulfarag Anmerkungen zu den Salomonischen Schriften, hrsg. v. A. R. Diss. gr. 8, ix, 29 S. Leipzig. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Sort.* m. 1.50.

Reinisch (Leo). Die Afar-Sprache. II. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 124 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 2. (I u. II, m. 3.80.)

Roehrig (Arminius). De P. Nigidio Figulo capita II. Diss. gr. 8, viii, 62 S. Coburg, *Riemann Jr. in Comm.* m. 1.50.

Rönsch (Herm.) *Semasiologische Beiträge zum lateinischen Wörterbuch.* 1 Hft. *Substantiva.* gr. 8, 78 S. Leipzig, *Fues.* m. 2.40.

Saarmann (Thdr.) *De Oenomao Gadareno.* Diss. gr. 8, 31 S. Lipsiae. Bonn, *Behrendt.* m. 1.

Schmidt (Max C. P.) *Zur Geschichte der geographischen Litteratur bei Griechen u. Römern.* gr. 4, 27 S. Berlin, *Gaertner.* m. 1.

Schmidt (Otto Ed.) *Die handschriftliche Ueberlieferung der Briefe Ciceros an Atticus, Q. Cicero, M. Brutus in Italien.* [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 108 S. m. 4 Taf. Leipzig, *Hirzel.* m. 6.

Schröter (Frz. Mart.) *Bemerkungen zu Strabo.* gr. 4, 17 S. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl. in Comm.* m. 1.

Schwartz (Ed.) *Scholia in Euripidem, collegit, recensuit, edidit E. Schw.* Vol. I. *Scholia in Hecubam, Orestem, Phoenissas.* gr. 8, xvi, 415 S. Berlin, *G. Reimer.* m. 9.

Streit (W.) *Zur Geschichte d. 2 punischen Krieges in Italien nach der Schlacht v. Cannae.* [Berliner Studien f. class. Philologie u. Archäologie, 6 Bd., 2 Hft.] gr. 8, 57 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 2.

Studien, Berliner, f. classische Philologie u. Archäologie. 6 Bd., 1 u. 2 Hft. gr. 8. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* Subscr.-Pr. m. 2.80; Einzelpr. m. 3.60. 1. 44 S. Subscr.-Pr. m. 1.20; Einzelpr. m. 1.60. 2. 57 S. Subscr.-Pr. m. 1.60; Einzelpr. m. 2.

Taciti (Cornelii) *opera quae supersunt.* Rec. Joa. Müller. Vol. II. *Historias et opera minora continens.* 8, 360 S. Prag, *Tempsky.* Leipzig, *Freytag.* à m. 1.50.

Vergili Maronis (P.) *carmina selecta, scholarum in usum ed.* Edm. Eichler. *Adiectae sunt tabulae II.* 8, xxx, 200 S. Prag, *Tempsky.* Leipzig, *Freytag.* m. 1.

Wahrmund (Adf.) *Handwörterbuch der deutschen u. neuarabischen Sprache.* 2 (Titel-)Ausz. gr. 8, xi, 560 S. Giessen, *Ricker.* 1870. m. 10; geb. m. 12.50. — *Handwörterbuch der neuarabischen u. deutschen Sprache.* 2 Abthlgn. 2 (Titel-)Ausz. gr. 8, xvi, 1028 u. 1240 S. Ebd. 1877. m. 30; geb. m. 34.50.

Weber (Ludw.) *Quaestionum Laconicarum capita 2.* Diss. gr. 8, 64 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.* m. 1.60.

Wohlrab (Mart.) *Die Platonhandschriften u. ihre gegenseitigen Beziehungen.* [Aus "Jahrb. f. class. Philol. 15 Suppl.-Bd."] gr. 8, 88 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 2.40.

Wróbel (Valentinus). *Aristotelis de perturbationibus animi doctrina.* Dissertationis particula I. gr. 8, 58 S. Sanoci, 1886. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1.20.

Zeitschrift f. Assyriologie u. verwandte Gebiete, in Verbindg. m. J. Oppert, A. H. Sayce, Eb. Schrader u. Anderen hrsg. v. Carl Bezold. 2 Bd. Jahrg. 1887. 4 Hfte., gr. 8, 1 Hft. 110 S. Leipzig, *O. Schulze.* m. 16; einzelne Hfte, m. 5.

Zimmermann (Emil). *De epistulari temporum usu Ciceronianus quaestiones grammaticae.* II. gr. 4, 31 S. Rastenburg. Leipzig, *Fock.* m. 1. (I et II, m. 1.80.)

Zingerle (Ant.) *Kleine philologische Abhandlungen.* 4 Hft. Mit e. Sachregister zur ganzen Sammlg. gr. 8, viii, 104 S. Innsbruck, *Wagner.* m. 3.20. (Cplt. ermäss. Pr. m. 6.40.)

## ITALIAN.

Atti della R. Accademia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti. Vol. XII, 1884-85-86. Napoli. In-4, pag. 160, 156, 44, 6. L. 20.

Cicerone. Dell' oratore. Testo riveduto ed annotato da Antonio Cima. Libro secondo. Torino. In-8, pag. 156. L. 2.50.

Giordano (G.) La cultura greca. Pensieri storico-estetici. Napoli. In-16, pag. 169. L. 3.

Levi (Simeone). Vocabolario geroglifico-copto-ebraico. Volume II. Torino. In-4, pag. 300. L. 30.

Omero. Iliade, trad. da Vincenzo Monti. 5 ediz. Torino. 2 vol. in-24. pag. 301, 327. (Biblioteca della gioventù italiana.) L. 1.20.

Platone. La prima tetralogia platonica, cioè l'Eutifrone, l'Apologia di Socrate, il Critone ed il Fedone, tradotti in volgare lingua ed annotati per Alcide Cliari. 2 ediz. riveduta. Torino. In-8, pag. 204. L. 2.50.

Zenoni (G.) Manuale teorico-pratico di sintassi latina, ad uso dei ginnasii. 4 ediz. aumentata. Venezia. In-16, pag. 421. L. 2.60.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Anglice Reddenda, or Extracts for Unseen Translation. Selected by C. S. Jerram. Second Series. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushings & Bailey*, 1887. 75 cts.

Badlam (Anna B.) Suggestive Lessons in Language and Reading for Primary Schools. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1887.

Bethe (E.) Quaestiones Diodoreae Mythologicae. Diss. Göttingen, 1887.

Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum edita curante Carolo Schenkl. Lipsiae, Sumpitus fecit *G. Freytag*, MCCCLXXVII.

Demosthenis Orationes Selectae. In usum scholarum ed. Carolus Wottke. 60 pf.

Herodoti Historiarum Liber Septimus. Ed. Alfred Holder. 50 pf.

Liber Octavus. 40 pf.

Quintiliani (M. Fabi) Institutionis Oratoriae Liber Decimus. Ed. Ferdinandus Meister. 25 pf.

Caspari (C. P.) Arabische Grammatik. Fünfte Auflage bearbeitet von August Müller. Halle-a.-S., *Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses*, 1887.

Cook (A. M.) Macmillan's Latin Course. First Year. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1887.

Deutsche Novelletten-Bibliothek mit etymologischen, grammatischen u. erklärenden Noten versehen von Dr. Wilhelm Bernhardt. Band I. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Comp. Verlag.*, 1887. 80 cts.

Ellis (Robinson). The Fables of Avianus. Edited, with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Commentary, Excursus, and Index. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* (Through Messrs. Cushings & Bailey, Baltimore.) 1887.

Frothingham (A. L., Jr.) Stephen Bar Sudaili the Syrian Mystic and the Book of Hierotheos. Leyden, *E. J. Brill*, 1886.

Genung (J. F.) The Study of Rhetoric. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1887.

Gomperz (Theodor). Zu Heraklit's Lehre u. den Ueberresten seines Werkes. Wien, *Carl Gerold's Söhne*, 1887.

Griechische Geschichte von Ernst Curtius. Erster Band. Bis zum Beginne der Perserkriege. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1887. 8 m.

Herodotus, VIII 1-90 (Artemisium and Salamis). With Introduction and Notes by E. S. Shuckburgh. (Pitt Press Series.) Cambridge, *At the University Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushings & Bailey*. 95 cts.

La langue et la littérature françaises depuis le IXème siècle jusqu'au XIVème siècle. Textes et glossaire par Karl Bartsch précédés d'une grammaire de l'ancien français par Adolf Horning. Paris, *Maisonneuve et Ch. Leclerc*, 1887.

Mittheilungen des Kaiserlich deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts. Athenische Abtheilung. Elfter Band, Viertes Heft. Athen, *Carl Wilberg*, 1887.

Nemesii Emesen Libri περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου versio Latina. Nunc primum edidit Carolus Holzinger. Leipzig, *G. Freytag, Prag, F. Tempsky*, 1887.

Plauti (T. Macci) Captivi. With Introduction and Notes by W. M. Lindsay. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* Baltimore, *Cushings & Bailey*. 60 cts.

Rosmini. The Ruling Principle of Education. Tr. by Mrs. William Grey. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1887. \$1.50.

Sallusti (C.) Crispi Catilina Jugurtha Historiarum Reliquiae. Henricus Jordan tertium recognovit. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*. 1 m. 50.

Schmidt (F. W.) Kritische Studien zu den Griechischen Dramatikern nebst einem Anhange zur Kritik der Anthologie. Dritter Band. Berlin, *Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung*, 1887. 7 m.

Spanish Idioms with their English Equivalents. Collected by Sarah Cary Becker and Federico Mora. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1887. \$2.00.

Thucydides, Book I. Edited on the basis of Classen's ed., by Charles D. Morris.

— Book VII. Edited on the basis of Classen's ed., by Charles Forster Smith. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1887.